

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 915, Vol. 35.

May 10, 1873.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE IMPERIAL MEETING AT ST. PETERSBURG.

THE Emperor WILLIAM has been paying a return visit to his nephew, and everything has been done that the Emperor ALEXANDER could devise to show honour to his uncle. There are but a limited number of means by which a royal guest can have his visit made satisfactory to him. Illuminations, dinners, balls, and reviews must make up the programme on every such occasion; and all that could be done has been done at St. Petersburg to make them each after their kind as splendid as possible. The especial pleasures offered to the Imperial visitor in the Russian capital were a visit to the tombs of the Czars and of the Imperial Family, including that of his sister, the wife of the Czar NICHOLAS, a call on General TODLEBEN, who gave him a lecture on a model of Sebastopol, and the treat of an evening at the French theatre, which, since the War of 1870, he has not been able to enjoy at Berlin. The German EMPEROR was attended by his great Minister and his great General, and the people of St. Petersburg enjoyed, and perhaps abused, the satisfaction of being able to stare at Prince BISMARCK and Count MOLTKE. For the latter it is said that they felt nothing but the unbounded admiration naturally conceded by a military nation to the first commander in Europe. Prince BISMARCK provoked more mingled feelings, and envy or fear even found utterance in a few hisses entirely out of keeping with the cordiality towards the visitor and his suite which was enjoined so far as official injunctions could reach. The Czar seemed delighted with an occasion of proclaiming, not so much to the world, or even to Germany, as to his own subjects, how very great is the value which he sets on the maintenance of the most friendly relations possible with the Court of Berlin. To preserve these friendly relations has been the special policy of his reign, and Prussians would be very ungrateful not to acknowledge how much they were indebted in 1866 and 1870 to the personal wish of the Czar to protect and favour the interests of his uncle. On this occasion he has announced that not only is this policy one on which he has set his heart, but that he sees in its maintenance the best security for the preservation of peace in Europe. What was said at Berlin last September is being said over again at St. Petersburg. The league of the uncle and nephew and of their brother EMPEROR at Vienna is a league of peace; and the German EMPEROR was especially earnest in proclaiming at St. Petersburg that the mere fact of the constitution of an Empire like the German Empire in the centre of Europe is a new guarantee for peace such as Europe has never had before. Each EMPEROR offers the other the pleasure of seeing the best of his regiments and the finest of his soldiers, and each assures the other that the mere fact that his brother Sovereign has been so kind as to come and look at this splendid machinery of war is an indisputable pledge that it is not likely to be put to a serious use. This is certainly the most comforting view of the purpose of expensive armies that could be suggested to overburdened taxpayers. They are, if the EMPERORS who command them are to be trusted, kept on foot in order that foreign sovereigns who see them reviewed may give so much pleasure by being present at the sight, and may receive so much pleasure from it, that a war is next to impossible.

No indications of national policy can really be gathered from the fact that one sovereign is very civil to another, and lights up his capital for him and has dinners and reviews for him. On the occasion of the last French Exhibition the Emperor of the FRENCH made a special point of the attendance of the King of PRUSSIA, and seemed as if he could not enjoy the Exhibition unless his pleasure was shared by the conqueror

of Sadowa. Subsequent revelations have informed us that this brotherly visit was paid immediately after the host had deferred war simply because all his best generals had told him his army was not ready, and after the guest had disappointed the calculations of French diplomacy by declaring that the French could not have an inch of German soil conceded to them. Both host and guest knew that their meeting had no tendency whatever to avert the coming struggle to which they both looked forward. On the other hand, when a sovereign who is possessed of great personal power, and whose position is such in his country that what he wishes is really attended to simply because he wishes it, cultivates honestly and cordially an alliance, his sympathies may have a real influence on the history of nations. There was a time when the personal sympathies of the late Emperor NAPOLEON for England kept France, or at least the military and predominant party in France, from a war with England which would have been most welcome to them. That the Czar honestly loves and reveres his uncle, and thinks that Germany is the best ally he can have, is a fact which very largely contributes to preserve the peace of Europe, and the Germans have already reaped considerable benefit from it. But, as usual, inspired panegyrists try to make too much of their case, and both in Russia and in Germany critics have found that they cannot go quite as far as official enthusiasm would wish them to go. In Germany, for example, a semi-official journal has recorded all the occasions on which the present King of PRUSSIA has in his long life been brought into contact with Russia; and, to read the tale as told in this way, any one would think that Russia had been consulting the convenience of Prussia and promoting its interest without intermission from the date of the battle of Leipsic. It will be only a very young generation of Germans who can believe this, and their elders cannot forget the sad days of humiliation when the nascent aspirations of Prussia towards German unity were rudely crushed by Russia, and a yoke of Russian supremacy was imposed on Prussia which was broken finally, not by the efforts of Germans, but by the victories of the Allies in the Crimean War. In the same way the courtly eulogist of Berlin cannot express his happiness at the stable condition and peaceful proclivities of Russia and Germany without having his fling at the unfortunate States of Western Europe. France and Spain undoubtedly present examples of States going through times of difficulty; but it is neither wise nor generous for the politicians of one country to be always pointing out how much better they manage things than the politicians of another country. If a Berlin official writer is sincere in his wish that France and Spain should again enjoy what he would consider to be a good Government, he must be aware that the surest method of driving Frenchmen and Spaniards in an opposite direction is to keep dinning in their ears that their goings on are looked on with disfavour at Berlin and St. Petersburg.

The German EMPEROR was prudent enough to abstain at St. Petersburg from using any language that could bear such a construction. He was anxious to avoid giving offence to any one. That he might give offence somewhat easily was probably brought home to him by the many symptoms which must occasionally have forced themselves on his notice that the friendship of Russia for Germany is a friendship of the Court rather than of the people. The Czar likes the Germans, but his subjects do not. Directly the pressure of official inspiration is removed and the Russian papers are free to speak, they begin with remarkable heartiness and unanimity to abuse Germans and Germany. They make the most of every sign of German weakness, and delight in prophecies showing that in the little struggles which go on in Galicia or Bohemia or elsewhere between Germans and non-Germans, the side

favoured by Russia is sure to win, and the side disliked by Russia is sure to lose. There are many causes for this unfriendliness of Russians towards Germany. In the first place, the mere fact that their own Government represses its manifestations probably adds fuel to the flame, for even the most loyal of nations may get wearied of being bid to love its sovereign's uncle. Then the Russians cannot bear the Germans in Russia, who are too pushing and exacting and far too industrious for them, who make better officials and clerks and merchants than they do, and who in one way or another are always getting much more than what Russians think their fair share of plums out of the pudding. Then there lurks in many Russian minds a sort of schoolboy feeling that, as the Germans have beaten the Austrians and the French, they are sure to try to beat the Russians also, simply because there is no one else for them to beat. This feeling does not perhaps make Russians uneasy. Every nation probably, except England, believes in its army till it is beaten, and Russians may take for granted that Germany would attack them in vain. But the apprehension that a struggle is coming some day produces an irritation which Germans who remember how irritated they were by the persuasion that, before long, France would attack them, must allow to be natural. The apprehension is, in the case of the Russians, apparently a groundless one, for neither Germany nor Germans have ever shown any real wish to embark in a causeless and wanton war with Russia. But the Russians may dislike the Germans, and their irritation at the thought of such a war may help to produce this dislike, although that irritation may be due to a misapprehension of German policy. Lastly, there is a vague sense among Russians that a new obstacle has grown up between them and the realization of some of the dreams they have been taught to cherish, and that this obstacle is the German Empire. Russians may not have any precise notion of what it is that they want, and they may be content to wait very patiently for it, whatever it may be. But they have been taught to believe that there was something very splendid planned as the gift of the future to them by their great CZAR, and that they were drawing nearer and nearer to the enjoyment of this acquisition. They cannot help now being alive to the fact that their prize will not be so easy to get as they fancied, and that it is the Germans who will probably stand in the way of their getting it. It is not perhaps to be wondered at, therefore, that in Russia this magnificent and cordial reception of the German EMPEROR is looked on as somewhat of a piece of Court show, in which good Russians may properly take part to please their CZAR, but which no one is to misinterpret into an indication of love for the German EMPEROR or his subjects.

MR. STANSFELD'S PROPOSALS.

EITHER Mr. STANSFELD is more prudent than his predecessor, or the Government has learned wisdom from experience. Two years ago Mr. GOSCHEN, having previously paved the way by a pamphlet in the form of the Report of a Committee, introduced an ambitious, and in some respects mischievous, measure which excited much uneasiness. The owners of landed property could not but perceive that the Bill was framed in a hostile spirit; and if they had not themselves discerned the tendency of Mr. GOSCHEN's proposals, they would have been enlightened by the applause which sentimental professors of newfangled theories about land bestowed on a measure which they declared to be a just attack on the squires. More impartial critics doubted whether it was just or expedient to frame systems of finance for the sake of punishing any class of the community. Mr. GOSCHEN himself, and Mr. GLADSTONE, more than once intimated in a sneering tone their intention of relieving the grievances of the ratepayers at the expense of those who had promoted the agitation. Further reflection has perhaps suggested a doubt whether a general transfer of liability to local burdens would be possible, although Mr. GOSCHEN's measure would in a large number of cases have caused serious hardship. An accidental coincidence is still more likely to have checked the enthusiasm of the Government. On the same night on which Mr. GOSCHEN moved for leave to introduce his Local Government Bill, Mr. BRUCE expounded his ill-fated project for ruining a class more powerful than small landowners. The licensed victuallers at once merged all political differences in a combined and unanimous hostility to the authors of the Beer Bill, and they have since convinced friends and enemies that they were not to be threatened with

impunity. The Durham election which occurred two or three weeks afterwards provided them with the first fruits of their revenge; and it would seem from the result of the contest at Bath in the present week that their wrath is not yet appeased. The Irish clergy had no electoral influence; and the Irish landlords were either powerless or opposed to the Government; but the publicans command many votes in every borough in the kingdom. Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues by this time understand that men sometimes prefer their own interests to the most sublime considerations of public morality. Mr. GOSCHEN's Bill, though it was a less hazardous experiment on the part of its promoters, necessarily offended and irritated the landowners against whom it was directed; and the occupiers, who have often reasons for not wishing to disturb existing relations, have shown but little eagerness to accept the proffered bribe. Some of the provisions of the Bill were obviously impracticable, and the plan of retaining or reviving the parish as the unit of local administration was generally disapproved. The Bill of 1871 was summarily dropped, and in the last Session no similar plan was proposed; but the Government is still pledged to deal with the whole subject of local government and taxation, and the majority obtained by Sir MASSEY LOPES rendered it impossible to postpone some scheme of readjustment.

No objection can be raised to Mr. STANSFELD's division of a task which could not prudently have been completed or undertaken in a single year. The Government still professes to intend that some contribution shall be made from the national revenue to the relief of local burdens; but Mr. LOWE announced in his speech on Mr. SMITH's motion that it was impossible to arrange the form or amount of the payment until the position of the recipient bodies was more fully ascertained. No similar scruple had prevented the offer of 1871 to surrender the house-tax for the benefit of the ratepayers; but perhaps the Government may anticipate a change in the opinion of the House of Commons. During the two or three years which must elapse before any measure of the kind can be proposed, it is possible that the ratepayers may become less urgent in their demands. The preliminary question of local government is neither simple nor easy, though Mr. STANSFELD, like Mr. GOSCHEN, is probably prepared with a plan to be considered by a Select Committee. Mr. GOSCHEN's Committee of 1870 was appointed at a time when the influence of the Government over the Liberal party was at its highest; and, as the result proved, the Chairman was justified in reckoning on the implicit obedience of his docile majority of nominees. On every important question a strict party division resulted in the victory of the Government, which had, according to an odd but recognized custom, a majority of one. Mr. GOSCHEN's Report, which was opposed by every Conservative member of the Committee, might as well have been produced in the shape of a pamphlet or a Bill, without the idle form of reference to a Committee. Mr. STANSFELD's proposals will perhaps be more independently discussed; nor, indeed, is he himself known to have, like Mr. GOSCHEN, arranged the principles and details of a measure beforehand. He has not explained whether he adopts the plan of dividing the burden of the rates between owners and occupiers. It is now generally admitted that there is a distinction in the incidence of local taxation as it respectively affects land or houses; but whether the owner or the occupier is at present chiefly taxed, any plan of readjustment ought to be narrowly watched. As Mr. FAWCETT shows in an article in the current number of the *Fortnightly Review*, it is necessary in determining the question to distinguish between places where the quantity of building land is practically unlimited and especially eligible situations such as the heart of the City of London. Wherever rates practically fall, either in whole or in part, on the owner, he has no relief to expect. There are sufficient reasons against any plan for diminishing the special burdens on land; but it is a novel and questionable theory that a tax, if it only lasts long enough, becomes a charge upon property in favour of the State. The liability of landowners or other taxpayers is not to supply a certain annual revenue, but to provide for necessary expenses which might possibly be diminished, or even in some instances abolished, with the effect of relieving the ratepayers.

The removal of exemptions, which is the principal object of Mr. GOSCHEN's Bill, although it will operate injuriously to certain kinds of property, cannot be reasonably resisted in principle. The State sets an example of self-denial, and provides an instalment of relief to ratepayers by surrendering its immunity in respect of public buildings and other property of the kind. The rates which are paid on a Post Office will, in accordance with Sir MASSEY LOPES's demand, be

contributed by the general taxpayer. In some places, as in Westminster and in the towns which contain dockyards or arsenals, the share of rates paid by the Government will be not inconsiderable. The extreme gratification which is derived from taxing a visitor or an alien has been illustrated by the constant attempts of parishes and unions to extort from the railways which traverse their districts the largest possible amount of contribution. No effort will be spared to assess Government property at the highest possible amount. The extension of the rate on coal-pits to metal-bearing mines has often before been proposed, and a rate on the value of land for sporting is defensible as far as the shooting has a money value. The provisions of the Bill will nevertheless in many cases work injustice, unless they are carefully framed. Many owners of land, though they retain the right of sporting, take little or no trouble to preserve game; and perhaps they scarcely kill as much in the year as would cover the wages of the keeper and the cost of powder and shot. Their liability to be rated ought to be measured by the price which a tenant would pay for the shooting if the same head of game were maintained. It would perhaps be easy by a system of strict preserving to keep ten times the actual head of game on the land; and a zealous preserver might be willing to pay a high rent for a tract of land now bare of game, with the intention of turning it into a poultry-yard of pheasants. If the Bill is equitably framed, the rate ought to be regulated by the quantity of game annually killed. Every keeper can return the numbers with the strictest precision, and for his own sake he will not be inclined to curtail the return. The proposed increase of valuation of country houses is more plausible than just. All other property is rateable according to the actual or possible income which it would produce to the owner, but a large house in the country, unless it is so situated that it would be likely to find a tenant, is a cause of expense and not of profit. Mr. STANSFELD has not professedly adopted Mr. GOSCHEN's iniquitous proposal of taxing mansions on the estimated cost of building. The needy owner of an ancient castle which could not be built for a hundred times his actual income might be ruined if a house were rated on the interest of the supposed cost of construction. If the rate, on the other hand, depends on the saleable value, it will be found that houses on large estates are in many cases thrown into the bargain by the vendors. In this and in other cases a just valuation is the first condition of a fair system of rating.

BATH AND GLOUCESTER ELECTIONS.

THE success at Bath and Gloucester is sufficient to inspire the Conservatives with great immediate satisfaction, and with no slight confidence as to their prospects at the next general election. They are important towns; the constituent bodies are of a varied character; the members whose death or retirement has created the vacancy have been respectable Liberals of a safe and sound kind, not likely to have excited any special opposition by their political career; and altogether there could scarcely have been found two better places to test what is the real amount of increasing strength that the Conservatives have acquired. These are exactly the kind of Conservative victories that make Liberal sitting members quake in their shoes; for they seem to make unsafe those delightful Liberal seats which are not dependent on the fancies, the prejudices, or the fanaticism of immense electoral bodies. At the bottom of the Conservative triumph lies no doubt the fact that political opinion runs now almost entirely in one groove—that of moderate Liberalism—and that many moderate Liberals incline to think that they can be more sure that the Conservative section of their party will be Liberal than that the Liberal section will be moderate. This cannot be called a Conservative reaction, for it is not a reaction at all, but it leads many persons with no strong political bias to give votes to Conservative candidates. Then again the Ballot is almost sure to act favourably to a Conservative candidate seeking to win a Liberal seat under such circumstances. An elector of Bath who read the addresses and speeches of Lord CHELSEA and Mr. MURCH would have noticed that no real difference of opinion divided the candidates. In fact, the only serious dispute between them appears to have been as to which of the two was entitled to the credit of having first adopted the bright idea of moving for the total abolition of the Income-tax. If a Liberal elector was inclined to think that of these two moderate Liberals he would feel the more comfortable with Lord CHELSEA, it was a much less difficult step for him to separate himself from

his party under the Ballot than it would have been if open voting had been in force, and his neighbours and friends could have made unpleasant remarks on his defection. This is a very serious consideration for many sitting Liberal members, and no doubt will co-operate with many other causes in making them desirous above all things that the dissolution shall be put off till next year. It is still doubtful whether the dissolution will be postponed beyond the autumn; but, if it is postponed, its postponement may be chiefly regarded as the reward which the Ministry will give to a number of staunch and zealous supporters who have no chance of re-election, or who feel that their chances are small, and claim that, in return for the enthusiastic aid they gave to the Government in its days of glory, they should now have one more short year added to the span of their Parliamentary life.

There is no reason to dispute that these two elections have some significance as to party prospects generally, but it is at least singularly instructive to turn to the details of local history that preceded them, and to learn what actually happened that may have had a practical bearing on the result. At Bath there was plenty of that pressure put on the candidates, both by the Permissive Bill agitators and by the publicans, which the House of Commons deplored with so much feeling and candour on Wednesday. Lord CHELSEA took a decided line, and said that he would vote against the Permissive Bill, and pointed out that if he was returned on the Tuesday he might be in time to vote against it in the House of Commons on the Wednesday, which he actually did, so that he was naturally the publicans' man. Mr. MURCH, on the other hand, declared that, if elected, he would neither vote for the Bill nor against it. This lost him the publicans without gaining him the Permissive Bill agitators. The unblushing mode in which both these sets of people determined to make the whole election depend on concurrence with their special views could not have been better illustrated than by what took place at their respective meetings after the views of the candidates became known. At the meeting of the Licensed Victuallers the Chairman began by announcing the cheering fact that their Association had over a hundred members, and the next step was to decide which way the whole set of them should vote. The first speaker said that Mr. MURCH was an excellent man, but that "he objected to him because he was rather against their trade to a certain extent than he was for it"; a view of political duties and responsibilities which wakened the audience to applause. He was followed by a bold tavernkeeper who urged that it was not with the politics of Lord CHELSEA or Mr. MURCH that they were concerned. In every other respect Mr. MURCH was deserving of the respect and the good will of the citizens of Bath, but he was halting between two opinions, and that would not do. Accordingly a resolution was proposed and was seconded by a person who avowed himself to be a Liberal, that all sections of the trade should be invited to vote for Lord CHELSEA. After this had been carried, a member of the Executive Council said that the voice of the publicans in the Bath election would have an immense influence on other constituencies at the next general election, and we are inclined to think he was right. On the other hand, the Permissive Bill people had their meeting, and they decided not to support Mr. MURCH. They adopted a resolution to the effect that his merely promising not to vote against their Bill did not "evoke enthusiasm or a desire to work for "Mr. MURCH," and the principal speaker announced that "if a party could win without them, it must be a very strong party indeed, and if it could not, then that party knew "how to get their aid." In other words, the Permissive Bill supporters determined that Lord CHELSEA, who was entirely against them, should get in rather than that Mr. MURCH, who was at least neutral and more friendly than not to them, should get in. And these are good electioneering tactics, for the great thing with these people is to get their support bought at elections; and the way to convince a candidate who may be elsewhere in Mr. MURCH's position that they are worth buying, was evidently to show that he would lose if he did not pledge himself to obey their dictation on condition of being returned by them. The majority for Lord CHELSEA was 260, and the abstention of the Permissive Bill people and the unanimity of the publicans go a long way to account for a majority of this number.

Bath returned a Conservative in the last Parliament, and for this Parliament returned two Liberals by a majority that was not very large. But Gloucester returned two Liberals for the last Parliament, and sent two Liberals to this Parliament by a majority of 400, and it is therefore a great

triumph for the Conservatives to have wrested a seat at Gloucester from their opponents. Here, again, the inevitable beer question seems to have had much to do with the result. The contest in part turned on questions of a curiously local character; the Liberal candidate averring that he paid his men higher wages than his adversary did, and the Conservative candidate retorting that he had more ships than his enemy had. But these minutiae were drowned in the beer. Most fortunately for Mr. WAIT, who is now the Conservative member, his friends were able to appeal to a letter he had written some time ago, enclosing a cheque for a Licensed Victuallers' Asylum, which proved that he was at heart a friend of the publicans, and that it was not merely in order to get a seat in Parliament that he simulated sympathy with their cause. This judicious benefaction, and the hearty support he was prepared to give to amendments such as the publicans desire to see made in the Act of last year, turned the scales in his favour; and at a meeting of his supporters, held on the eve of the polling day, he had the satisfaction of announcing that he had just had put into his hands a copy of a resolution at which the publicans had unanimously arrived, and which was to the effect that of the two candidates the publicans pronounced him to be the more favourable to the interests of the trade, and would therefore all vote for him. The publicans have, in short, shown by the Bath and Gloucester elections that they can do much more to affect the result of an election than their opponents can do, and that they mean to do all they can. As a general rule, it will be more easy and natural to Conservatives than to Liberals to fall in with the mode of viewing social matters which commends itself to the publicans. The Conservatives, as a rule, are less likely to have run off into any of the grooves in which the energy of sentimental philanthropy expends itself. Lord CHELSEA had no hesitation, when asked about the Contagious Diseases Acts, in replying that he thought their object was an excellent one, and that they ought to be upheld. It is wrong that such minute matters as the Licensing Act and the Contagious Diseases Acts should be made the sole turning-point on which the election of a person to take charge of the interests of a great Empire depends; but if folly and narrow passions make them such turning-points, it must be a comfort to be able to vote for a candidate who laughs at the humiliating farce of the Permissive Bill, and scorns the indecent agitation on the other question. But it must be said, in justice to the constituencies, that if they now allow elections to turn on such very trifling matters, and submit to the whims of cliques, this is in a great measure due to accidental and temporary causes. There is no subject of general political interest now to enliven and divide the electoral bodies. How complete the lull in politics is may be gathered from the fact that the Liberal candidate at Bath had to promise not to support Mr. MIALL, and announced that he was entirely against the extension of the franchise to agricultural labourers. When thus the platform of both parties is made virtually the same, each fraction of the voters thinks not unnaturally of itself and its own interests and grievances; and the Conservative candidate at Gloucester had to please his working-men friends by engaging to support an alteration of the Masters and Servants Act which would place masters and servants on an equality, and, when he got among porters and pointsmen, he pledged himself, if elected, to endeavour, by some means which he did not specify, to reduce the hours of railway labour. Here, again, we do not see why there should be any difference between Liberal and Conservative candidates. What one can safely and honestly promise the other can promise; so that really the chief distinction between the two parties as regards the forecast of their electioneering prospects seems to be that the beer interest has concluded that the Conservatives are the most to be trusted, and that the beer interest has shown itself to be very powerful.

FRENCH PROSPECTS.

IT is hard to say whether the prolonged holiday of the Assembly is in the present state of French affairs an advantage or an inconvenience. Had the Assembly been sitting at the moment of the Paris election, the terror of the majority would probably have found expression in some wild proposal to extinguish Radicalism by giving the Radicals a genuine reason for their political existence; and as suggestions of this kind usually cause far more excitement than the chance of their being adopted justifies, the tranquillity of the country is so far furthered by the absence of the deputies from Versailles. On the other hand, the agitation to which

the Conservative party in France is at present a prey may become more intense by suppression. When the recess is over the majority in the Assembly will have to put their fears into words, and it sometimes happens that the mere effort to do this exercises a calming influence upon the patient. The symptoms do not seem quite so alarming when they are frankly stated as they did when they were nursed in secrecy. When Conservative leaders are forced to affix a precise value to the return of M. BARODET for Paris, they may insensibly be led to confess that the fact that the capital has made good its traditional reputation by returning a Radical deputy need not altogether undo the work of the last two years. It is disappointing no doubt to find that even a Republic does not gain acceptance in Paris if it has the epithet Conservative tacked on to it; but the attitude of the Conservative party towards this particular constituency goes some way towards accounting for the unpopularity which attaches to the name. The element in the population which would ordinarily be most opposed to revolutionary projects has been rendered tolerant of them by the folly of the Conservatives in treating the return of the Assembly to Paris as a typically Radical measure. The Paris shopkeepers may naturally argue that the worst evil that can befall them under a Radical Government is the loss of business, and that as they are already exposed to this by the hostility of the Conservatives, they may as well try whether their luck may not be improved by giving the cards another shuffle. That the Conservatives will admit that they have made a blunder in thus alienating their hereditary allies is not to be expected; but they may at least come to recognize that this alienation is only an unavoidable drawback to the policy they have deliberately adopted. If they can be brought to see this, they may cease to regard the recent election as the exceptional and inexplicable horror which they now esteem it.

Unfortunately the absence of justification for excitement does not involve the absence of excitement. Though there may be no sufficient reason why the feeling of the country should have been changed by the return of M. BARODET, it may have been changed notwithstanding. As yet there are no data forthcoming on which to found a conclusion as to this point. The language of the Conservative deputies is reported to be extremely violent; but the peculiarity of French politics for some time past has been that the Conservative deputies do not represent the Conservative electors. The two may have been brought into harmony by the unexpected exhibition of Radical strength in Paris, but there is no present ground for thinking that this change has taken place. The Conservative deputies are coming back to Versailles in an exceedingly embittered frame of mind; but it is at least possible that this may result from the discovery that their constituents are not so much alarmed as themselves, and are consequently so much the less likely to return them at the general election, and so much the more likely to support M. THIERS in the interval before the general election. It would be unsafe to assume that this is the cause, because it is also possible that the violent counsels attributed to the Conservative leaders may proceed from the conviction that they may now for the first time count upon the co-operation of the country in giving effect to them. The fact that the provincial elections have all gone in favour of Republicans of various shades does not of itself disprove this, both because the elections were held on the same day as the Paris election, and because the Conservative electors are wont to evince alarm, not so much by voting for a candidate of their own way of thinking as by abstaining from voting altogether. Nor is it easy even to speculate with any assurance on what is going on in their minds. They have lately shown a wholly unexpected amount of common sense in relation to politics, and the wonderful success with which M. THIERS has governed France is mainly due to this fact. But then they may have attached a disproportionate value to the apparent acquiescence of Paris in M. THIERS's rule, and the rejection of his FOREIGN MINISTER by the Parisians may create an equally unexpected distrust of M. THIERS's power to go on governing. In this case the power of the extreme section of the party will be greatly increased. They, at all events, know what they want, and will undertake, if they are given what they ask, to ensure the maintenance of order. If the moderate Conservatives no longer feel their old faith in the Government, they will be likely to listen to these assurances from sheer despair of attaining safety by less desperate counsels.

For more than two years M. THIERS has steadily endeavoured to form a Republic by the hands of the Conservatives instead of, as on all former occasions, by the hands of the Radicals. The main obstacle which he has had to encounter

in this undertaking has been the unwillingness of the Conservatives in the Assembly to be employed for such a purpose. Hitherto this unwillingness has been balanced by the readiness of the Conservatives out of doors to support the Government. The Assembly has done as much as it dared to thwart M. THIERS, but whenever things have come to a crisis it has shrunk from placing itself in open antagonism to its constituents. It may be that opposition to M. THIERS would no longer involve it in this open antagonism. It may be that the Assembly thinks that opposition to M. THIERS would no longer have this effect, though its reasons for thinking so are insufficient. Either way the danger of a collision between the Executive and the Legislature would be greatly increased. M. THIERS is pledged to bring in Bills which, if framed in a Republican sense, can hardly fail to be exceedingly distasteful to an Assembly in which the majority are Monarchists at heart. If these Bills are rejected, M. THIERS will be placed once more in the dilemma in which he found himself last autumn. Either he must take his orders from an Assembly with which he is not in accord, which would be to sacrifice his influence in the country; or he must resign his office, and thereby abandon France to the civil strife which would probably accompany any attempt to bring about a Restoration, whether in name or in fact; or he must appeal to the country to judge between him and the Assembly, and to declare which of the two it prefers. If he should be reduced to this choice of evils, the ill effects of the Radical policy in preferring M. BARODET to M. DE RÉMUSAT would become terribly apparent. It is essential to M. THIERS's success in the very difficult enterprise in which he is engaged that he should feel entire confidence in the support of the country. Nothing short of this can give his policy the necessary certainty and decision. There are not wanting symptoms that M. THIERS no longer feels this entire confidence in the support of the country; that he, like other people, is unable to pronounce on the instant whether the effect of the Paris election has or has not been to alienate the provincial Conservatives, who have up to this time stood his staunch friends. Unless his reliance on the country is speedily restored, his hold on the country can hardly be maintained. To all appearance, the hope that the Assembly will be wise in time grows fainter every day. Little can be looked for when the Session begins again except a renewal of the attempt to force M. THIERS into a line of action which would create an incurable breach between him and the Republican party. If he shows any want of resolution in resisting this attempt, it is certain to be prosecuted with increased vigour, because its authors will be proportionately assured that in the end his resistance will be overborne. M. THIERS will thus be reduced to make his choice between absolute submission to the Assembly and open repudiation of its claim to represent the country; and if he really entertains a suspicion that this claim, since the Paris election, has become less ill founded than he has heretofore held it to be, he may have no option but to accept the former alternative. There is another element in the calculation which must not be left altogether out of sight. Very little is known in England of the political temper of the French army, or of the line which Marshal MAC-MAHON would take in the event of an open conflict between the President and the Assembly. Both the troops and their commander may be devoted to the President, and in that case the Assembly would think twice before essaying a Conservative *coup d'état*. But their devotion to the Assembly may turn out to be greater than their devotion to M. THIERS, and in that case the Assembly might defy M. THIERS to hasten its dissolution even by a day. If the country were clearly on the side of the President, even the assurance of being supported by the army might fail to nerve the Assembly to adopt so bold a policy. But if M. BARODET's return has really wrought a change in this respect, the prospect of the Assembly's having recourse to some violent measure may be less remote than its previous irresolution would lead the world to imagine.

SIR CHARLES DILKE'S MOTION.

MR. GLADSTONE'S speech on Sir C. DILKE's motion proved that, among his many oratorical gifts, he is capable of succeeding in a style which he has not habitually cultivated. It would have been impossible to enumerate more skilfully all the commonplaces which serve as arguments, and sometimes as very good arguments, against troublesome proposals. The question of redistributing electoral power is complicated and difficult; it cannot advantageously be con-

sidered in the second half of the Session; other important measures demand the attention of Parliament; and finally the PRIME MINISTER expresses a well-founded confidence that the House will reject the motion by a decisive majority. In former times Sir ROBERT PEEL and Lord PALMERSTON excelled in the art of abstaining, under cover of conventional phrases, from binding themselves by superfluous pledges. Mr. GLADSTONE is ordinarily more candid and more impulsive than his predecessors; but it is satisfactory to find that on occasion he also can get rid of an inconvenient resolution without enunciating any general principle. His speech was quite as good an answer as the motion deserved; and the House must have heard with a feeling of relief that Mr. GLADSTONE also could be prudent and deliberately dull. It is not impossible that the present generation may witness the accomplishment of Sir C. DILKE's ulterior designs, to which an equalization of electoral power would effectively contribute. The meaning of all schemes of the kind is to transfer political power to the poorest class, which forms the numerical majority of the population, or rather to the demagogues who would govern through the aid and in the name of the multitude. The Friends of the People, finding themselves unable to command the confidence of their equals, hope to suppress personal independence by appealing exclusively to the homogeneous masses. Those who hold that almost any method of selecting rulers is better than universal suffrage, take little interest in the various proposals which are devised for the coercion of the intelligent minority. If Sir C. DILKE, and other reformers of the same kind, are strong enough to remodel the Constitution, they will sooner or later create equal electoral districts, as a step to the establishment of a Republic. In the meantime they address to an Assembly which has no sympathy with their opinions ostensible arguments which can have no influence on the opponents of revolutionary measures. It is but an idle amusement to collect statistics for the purpose of proving the notorious fact that some constituencies are several times larger than others. Small boroughs have been quite as judicious as large towns in the discharge of their electoral duties. Sir R. PEEL sat for Tamworth, Lord PALMERSTON for Tiverton, and Sir ROUNDELL PALMER for the borough of Richmond. Mr. LOWE found refuge at Calne from the intolerant violence of Kidderminster. He now represents the only constituency in England which would four or five years ago have been sufficiently intelligent and independent to select a man of great ability, who as a Liberal had no claim on Conservative electors, while he had given the deepest offence to the advocates of democracy. With perfect consistency Sir C. DILKE proposes to disfranchise the Universities, suggesting that Mr. HARDY and Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR might easily find seats elsewhere. Mr. HARDY, till he was elected for Oxford, represented the borough of Leominster, which then returned two members to Parliament. It is uncertain whether he would find a vacant seat if he were to retire from Oxford; and of Dr. PLAYFAIR it is enough to say that the academic constituency which he represents was the first to discover his merits.

The theorists who with good reason desire to secure the representation of minorities would, if they looked around them, find that their object is already in some degree attained through the unequal distribution of electoral power. All parties, and nearly all interests, are represented in the House of Commons, although a Conservative in Scotland or in Birmingham is as incapable of influencing an election as if he were a Radical candidate for an old-fashioned county. Mr. COLLINS was willing to accept Sir C. DILKE's proposal, on condition that the new and artificial contrivance of a cumulative vote should be imposed as a condition of the equalization of the franchise. A Parliament elected by labourers and artisans would make short work of any arrangement which interfered with the predominance of numbers. Even if it were admitted that the elaborate devices of modern projectors produced a just system of representation, no institution is worth much which exists, if it exists at all, at the mercy of those who have an interest in overthrowing it. It is not worth while to dwell on the anomalies which are found inseparable from the most ingenious systems of cumulative voting. The fatal defect of intrinsic weakness is a sufficient condemnation of the theory. Mr. BRIGHT never more thoroughly represented the democratic instinct than when he denounced with passionate indignation the experiment which seemed likely to endanger the supremacy of his party at Birmingham. Whatever may be the opinion of a few speculative Radicals, the genuine supporters of popular suffrage desire exclusively to promote the political interests

of the most numerous class. They are on their own principles perfectly right in objecting to measures which would practically withdraw from them an ostensible concession. Systems of the kind have been tried on a small scale in some parts of the United States where probably little interest is taken in political matters; but the deepest conviction of American Republicans is that the majority is practically supreme, if not theoretically infallible. There is no reason why Liberals should not amuse their leisure with devising schemes for teaching Leviathan to go in harness; but Conservatives such as Mr. COLLINS will find it safer to retain what is left of the old institutions which still give them a share of power. A professed Republican who proposes a fundamental change in the representative system is not likely to consult the welfare of monarchy, or of the numerous feelings and interests which find a symbol in the Crown. It is satisfactory to find that for the present Mr. GLADSTONE is not prepared to admit universal flesh and blood to the enjoyment of the franchise.

There is some reason to hope that the House of Commons will deal as summarily with Mr. TREVELYAN's proposal as with Sir C. DILKE's. The extension of household suffrage to counties would render the franchise uniform; and it is easy to see that electoral districts would be equalized when there was no longer any distinction between different constituencies. It matters little on what pretext a mischievous project may be rejected. It is now the fashion to object to the transfer of political power to farm-labourers on the ground that they are ignorant, although it is by no means certain that they might not become more formidable if they were as well educated as the artisans of the towns. Privileges and disqualifications are, within certain limits, valuable securities of order and freedom. The extreme faction which now forms a small and active minority in the House of Commons not unnaturally endeavours to strengthen itself by readjusting the constituencies in such a manner as to increase the numbers of the party. The representatives of the labourers in the counties would support Sir C. DILKE; and the members for equal electoral districts would vote with Mr. TREVELYAN. It is useless to remonstrate with ambitious politicians who perfectly understand the means by which their own objects would be most effectually promoted. With those who prefer good government to symmetry, arguments deduced from any supposed right to the franchise have but little weight. It is possible that, if demands for the extension or equalization of the franchise can be adjourned for a few years, the example of foreign and colonial communities may enlighten general opinion on the merits of democracy. In the United States the effects of universal suffrage may be traced rather in the prevailing corruption than in anarchy or violence. The Australian colonies have not tried the experiment as long; but their Parliamentary success is not brilliant nor encouraging. On the Continent of Europe universal suffrage, though it is regarded in theory as the great security for freedom and equality, commands no respect from democrats. Any Assembly which, having been elected by the whole community, ventures to oppose the caprices of the mob is immediately accused of treachery or usurpation. No equalization of electoral districts would have induced the rabble of Madrid to abstain from menacing the Permanent Committee of the Cortes. The sovereign people, after delegating their power to their favourite nominees, commonly reserve the right of exercising their absolute power in their own persons. French demagogues have always frankly professed their contempt for any representative body which might hesitate in its attachment to the Republic. The only Parliament which has thus far succeeded in asserting and administering supreme power is the English House of Commons, which has at present not been chosen by constituencies regularly divided into equal electoral districts.

JUDICIAL PEERAGES.

LORD SALISBURY, who has often expressed dissatisfaction with the present condition of the House of Lords, probably proposed his amendment to the Judicature Bill for the admission of Judges of Appeal to the peerage rather for the purpose of keeping the controversy open than in the expectation that his proposal would be adopted by the House. The mover himself was perhaps not even prepared to acquiesce in the immediate acceptance of his own project; for, although Lord GRANVILLE expressed but a faint objection to the plan, while Lord GREY gave it cordial support, Lord SALISBURY of his own accord withdrew the amendment. If at any future time it is thought expedient to attach peerages to judicial offices, a slight alteration would render Lord SALISBURY's plan

less objectionable. There would be no inconvenience in allowing judicial peers to retain their seats for life, when, through the effects of age or infirmity, they had ceased to sit in the Court of Appeal. It is true that bishops who have under the provisions of modern Acts resigned their sees cease to sit in the House of Lords, and that the prelates of the Irish Church have, since the suppression of the Establishment, been reduced to a private condition; but, according to constitutional theory, the spiritual peers are an Estate of the Realm, and consequently they must be actual incumbents of their respective sees. A more practical reason for construing their Parliamentary claims strictly is that modern opinion or prejudice barely tolerates the presence of bishops in the House of Lords, and is entirely opposed to any increase of their number. The only members of the House who have but a temporary tenure of their seats are the anomalous representatives of the Scotch and Irish peerages. If the presence of the Judges of Appeal in the House of Lords is desirable, they might still make themselves useful after their retirement from office, except that they would in the majority of cases be so far advanced in life that their retention of their seats would at the worst be harmless. Lord GRANVILLE raised the plausible objection that there would be an inconvenience in listening to twenty-one professional speeches on every debate on legal questions; but the law lords who at present discuss legal matters with little assistance from laymen would be the principal sufferers by a large addition to their number. The argument was perhaps good enough to be urged against a tentative motion which was not seriously pressed. Graver reasons for hesitation may be found in the risk which attends any disturbance of an institution which depends in a great measure for existence on its great antiquity.

The jealousy which has been traditionally felt against the combination of judicial and political functions was not noticed in the short conversation on Lord SALISBURY's amendment. It is highly desirable that the Lord Chancellor should be a member of the Cabinet, and that the same person in his turn should have influence in the councils of the Opposition. The Master of the Rolls may still legally sit in the House of Commons, but it is perhaps fortunate that he can seldom find a constituency. Forty years ago the great object of BROUGHAM's ambition was to retain his seat for Yorkshire in conjunction with the Mastership of the Rolls; but it was fortunate for his party, and perhaps for himself, that his aspirations were disappointed. It is not at all certain that respect for judicial impartiality might not be impaired if half-a-dozen of the Judges of Appeal happened to take an active part in Parliamentary conflicts. Lord SALISBURY, in proposing to confer upon them a novel and qualified kind of peerage, seems to have assumed that they would content themselves with the modest function of acting as legal assessors to the House of Lords. In deference to the same modern etiquette which prescribes to the clergy a feminine narrowness of decorum, the bishops are now expected to affect indifference or ignorance during ordinary discussions of public interest. A body of elderly lawyers, conscious of knowledge and ability, might perhaps assert their right, as long as they occupied seats in the House of Lords, to take an active part in its general business. It is true that, as Lord SALISBURY and Lord GRANVILLE declared, Governments would scarcely pack the House with partisan judges as unscrupulously as if they were life peers without any special qualification; but some legal promotions are always made on political grounds, and there is nothing to prevent lawyers from being also politicians. The official peers would be as competent to judge of political and legislative questions as their hereditary colleagues; but the popularity or unpopularity which they might possibly acquire would be equally injurious to their position as judges. The difficulty would not be insuperable if there were sufficient reasons for introducing a considerable number of judges into the House of Lords; but, if the measure is ever seriously proposed, the objection would require mature consideration. Every successive scheme for altering the condition of the House of Lords illustrates the complicated nature of the problem.

Lord GRANVILLE took occasion to repeat an opinion which he has frequently expressed, that the House of Lords committed an error in rejecting the claim of a life peer to sit in the House. It is not worth while to discuss at length a hackneyed controversy. A great change in the Constitution, even if it can be shown to be the revival of an antiquarian practice, ought not to be effected at the discretion or caprice of any Minister. The arguments for or against life peerages have little connexion with the failure of Lord CRANWORTH's rash experiment. The discussion on Lord RUSSELL's motion of three or four years ago tended to dispel some common illu-

sions. It was found, on investigating the claims of different classes of supposed candidates for a life peerage, that in the majority of cases the honour would be reserved for mediocrity. On that occasion Lord SALISBURY suggested that life peerages might be conferred on great merchants or manufacturers, who would by the nature of the case have acquired ample fortunes. It is after all probable that some useful members might be added to the House of Lords if the choice of peers were not partially limited by the necessity of endowing an hereditary title; but there would be some risk of creating an inferior caste in an Assembly which has always more or less carefully asserted the equality of its members. The profound belief of the peers themselves in the superiority of birth to merit is indicated by their successful persistence in compelling the bishops to appear in ridiculous costumes. Long ago all peers wore their robes in the House of Lords; and when, in common with the rest of the world, the lay peers disused their official uniform, they insisted that the bishops should continue to proclaim to all spectators their strictly professional position. In prizeing their own hereditary character the peers display a sound instinct; for rank, and the training and habits which it implies, account in a great degree for the deference which in England is still paid to the aristocratic Assembly. With few and insignificant exceptions, a peerage affords a sufficient guarantee that its incumbent is a gentleman; and among five hundred cultivated men of high social station, it is always found that a sufficient number of statesmen and administrators is included. The average ability in the House of Lords is certainly not inferior to the House of Commons; and it is scarcely a misfortune that a great portion of the intelligence of the community is to be found outside of both Houses of Parliament.

One of Lord SALISBURY's reasons for his proposal was founded on his wish to maintain in a new form the ancient connexion between the House of Lords and the Supreme Court of Appeal. In deference to general opinion and to expediency, and in some degree under the influence of Lord CAIRNS, the House of Lords has consented to abdicate its judicial functions, except that it will still receive appeals from Scotch and Irish Courts. There is no doubt that the sacrifice of a power which was only formal and nominal will in some degree detract from the authority of the House; but it seems a far-fetched contrivance to make judges into peers because peers have hitherto been judges. In early times the most indispensable condition of judicial authority was power; and when it was recognized that the necessary learning and experience were only to be found among lawyers, the House of Lords retained its jurisdiction by delegating its functions to Chancellors and other law lords. If the members of the Supreme Court of Appeal were to take their seats in the House of Lords, their judicial privileges would henceforth be confined to themselves, and would be exercised in a separate capacity. Lay peers have not claimed any share in ordination or consecration because they sit in the House by the side of the bishops. It is not worth their while to insist on retaining a fragment or a shadow of their former functions, although the Lord Mayor and Aldermen still impose on themselves the solemn duty of sitting mute by the side of the judges at the Old Bailey. If any new class of peers is to be invented, it must take its part in the general business of the House of Lords; and, as Lord GRANVILLE suggested, it would be anomalous to extend the privilege of peerage exclusively to a single profession. If high office is to be represented in the House of Lords, the Adjutant and Quartermaster-General, or the Admiral of the Channel Fleet, might be as fitly summoned as a Judge of Appeal; and probably the President of the College of Physicians would advance a similar claim. If there were a question of framing a new Constitution, there would be nothing absurd in preferring eminent public or professional functionaries to the heirs of great estates, or to the descendants of distinguished statesmen and lawyers; but the House of Lords exists because it has long existed; and that which exists is not a Senate of the heads of professions, but an hereditary Assembly of a peculiar and indeed unique character. Lord SALISBURY's peers or Lord GRANVILLE's would derive any lustre which might attach to their titles from association with a body of peers born in the purple.

THE DEBATE ON THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

THE debate on the Permissive Bill encourages the belief that the voice of common sense cannot be altogether drowned by clamour. The Alliance is spending its 100,000*l.* upon an agitation which tends to produce a counter-alliance of moderate people against the Permissive Bill. The publicans

ought to rejoice to hear that the leaders of the Alliance are not discouraged by the vote of the House of Commons on the Bill, but, on the contrary, that they regard that vote as a call to more vigorous and determined efforts. Violence on one side of a question always inclines cautious judgment towards the other side; and members of Parliament who may be puzzled by the intricacies of the licensing law will unhesitatingly resent the insolent dictation of the Alliance. There is not likely to be much more of the absurdity of voting for this Bill as a sort of general protest that something ought to be done by Parliament to suppress intemperance. Mr. BRUCE opposed the Bill on an estimate, which can hardly be disputed, of the consequences of its passing. He said that it would largely increase the responsibilities of the Home Secretary. There would be continual opposition to it; riots would have to be put down, and scandalous evasions of the law must either be punished or winked at by the Government. This may be taken as the opinion formed of the measure by the experienced officers of the department over which Mr. BRUCE presides. But indeed no authority is needed to support a conclusion which is manifest to ordinary intelligence. The peace of the country could not be preserved if attempts were made to enforce this Bill.

It was time that Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE intervened to raise a laugh out of this most tedious of all annual performances. The inquiry as to the origin of crime is obscure, and even if the opinion be correct that women cause crime in men, the Alliance would answer that drink perverts the women who cause crime in men. The opinion is entertained by many respectable gentlemen who speak on platforms that girls go astray through love of drink, and it may be assumed in favour of these worthy persons that they are not well acquainted with the subject on which they speak. But ordinary observation will teach us that the passion for drink hardly develops itself among men until they are nearer thirty than twenty years of age, and the same remark would apply still more forcibly to girls of eighteen, with whom the love of dress and of admiration are commonly the strongest motives. It is quite true that women of immoral life are often drunkards, but the inference that drink led to immorality would be fallacious. A curious book might be written upon the crimes of sober men, which, if less frequent, are more dangerous than those of drunkards. A sober man may be a libertine or a gambler, and forgeries and embezzlements have been frequently committed to supply the demands of women or of play. When human nature is in question SHAKESPEARE is a good authority, and we may remember that his great criminals, such as IAGO, MACBETH, and CLAUDIUS King of Denmark, are not drunkards. The professional thief in England is not a drunkard, for the best of reasons—that he could not succeed in his profession or any other unless he kept himself sober in the hours of work. When he enjoys the rewards of success, no doubt the best wine he can procure is one of them, but there are others to which he attaches at least equal value. The truth was neatly put by a speaker in the debate who said that it was not drunkenness that brought on crime, but crime or vice that brought on drunkenness. A good deal was said by Sir WILFRID LAWSON about the working classes, who, undeterred by a coalition between gentlemen and licensed victuallers, are to deal at the next election with the great evil of drunkenness. It is remarkable that the working-man seems to be capable of everything except keeping himself sober. He can deplore the abandoned condition of the nation to which he belongs, or of the town in which he lives, but he cannot in his own person give an example of the temperance which he urges upon his neighbours. With good intentions, he cannot pass an open public-house. "The poor man is now the powerful man," but he has no power over himself. This would be a melancholy picture if true, but the working-man is not quite so contemptible a creature as his friends represent. It is true that many gentlemen, or "swells," as Sir WILFRID LAWSON calls them, oppose this Bill, and they do so because they are magistrates and answerable for the tranquility of the districts in which they live. One of the speakers in the debate, being a Chairman of Quarter Sessions, was surely well qualified to deal with this point. He said that in all probability the attempt to put it into force would result in something little short of revolution. If this opinion is only partially correct, the annual debate upon this Bill is simply waste of time. Indeed it may be doubted whether the authors of the Bill have ever seriously considered what would be the result of passing it. They know that it will not pass; and even if it did pass, they would not be called upon to deal with consequent disturbances. It should be remembered that the in-

habitants of a town would not be the only persons interested in the application to it of this Bill. Suppose, for example, that it were applied to the town of Stratford-on-Avon, which has an interest for the whole English-speaking race. If an American or Australian comes to England, he inevitably finds his way to Stratford, and he probably eats and drinks there. But under the Bill drinking might be forbidden to him. Other places are great resorts of traders, and in various ways the public at large, and not merely the dwellers in a district, are concerned with its condition. Take the case of an assize town, or of a town selected for the meeting-place of an agricultural or other society having members in all parts of England. We might perhaps venture to add the case of a Church Congress. This may be rather a narrow ground on which to oppose the Bill; but if the objection is unanswerable, as we think it is, it is necessarily sufficient. Assume that which we deny—that a majority of ratepayers are entitled to bind the inhabitants of a district upon this question—still they are not entitled to bind the people of England who have an interest that travellers should find suitable accommodation in every town. But that which concerns the entire public can only be dealt with by Parliament, and no Bill is needed to give to Parliament the power of legislation.

By the help of statements and counter-statements we may hope gradually to arrive at the truth as to the working of prohibitory laws in those countries where they have been enacted. Mr. DALRYMPLE reported that in Philadelphia he was told that people were in favour of the Maine Liquor Law, but against its enforcement. He also said that at an hotel in Boston he had the choice of three hundred sorts of wine. Mr. DALRYMPLE's statement is curiously confirmed by Mr. NEAL DOW, who supposes himself to be writing to the *Times* in correction or explanation of it. Mr. Dow says:—"Boston is controlled by the vote of immigrants from Europe, and the city Government represents the wishes of that class of people upon the liquor question; but at no hotel in Boston are any liquors or wines to be seen on sale; they are carefully kept out of sight." It appears, therefore, that Boston is part of a State which has enacted a prohibitory law, but in deference to the wishes of "a class of people" in Boston the law is not enforced. This shows what would be likely to happen in England under such a law. In deference to the wishes of a class of people capable of expressing these wishes emphatically the law would not be enforced. But then it is said that liquor is not "seen on sale" at hotels in decorous Boston; and we might add that even in debauched England it is the practice to keep wine in bin or cask until the customer requires it. The local knowledge which Mr. NEAL DOW possesses of Philadelphia seems to confirm Mr. DALRYMPLE's story as to the Sunday walk of three or four miles which apparently brought him into a district for which a prohibitory law had been enacted, and where he was supplied with Philadelphia ale. The example of Boston naturally suggests that of London. As long as we get up what are called International Exhibitions it may be assumed that we desire foreigners to visit London. But if we do desire this, we must allow foreigners to make themselves as comfortable as our climate and customs will allow. As things are, foreigners find themselves sufficiently miserable in London, and we can hardly contemplate to inflict upon them the further hardship of cutting off their drink. But indeed the notion of applying the Permissive Bill to London is too manifestly absurd to bear discussion. It is strange that the House of Commons should be compelled year after year to debate a measure that is so evidently impractical. As Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE truly says, "There is nothing so ridiculous that you may not get up a body of men to propose it." There seems to have been a general desire in the House of Commons to give a quietus to this agitation, but we must pay the leaders of it the compliment of allowing that they are as nearly as can be irrepressible. The whole thing has become beyond expression tedious, and still the annual debate is held and reported, and discussed in articles, until everybody except the chiefs of the Alliance is weary alike of speaking, writing, or reading anything upon the subject. Mr. BRIGHT has influence on other subjects with the authors of this agitation, but the sensible letter which he has written on the Permissive Bill is likely to be as much wasted as reason and common sense usually are when addressed to enthusiasts. Sir WILFRID LAWSON of course says that the opponents of his Bill are fanatics, and we have heard of madmen who were convinced that all the world except themselves were mad. It is perhaps fortunate that Mr. DALRYMPLE has a hobby which he rides in vigorous opposition to the Permissive Bill.

The authors of that Bill would lock up the drink, while he would lock up the drunkard. His proposal is perhaps the more absurd of the two, but he almost redeems his character for rationality by maintaining that the abuse of alcohol does not condemn its use. He collected information in America which the supporters of the Permissive Bill would find it difficult to answer. But they can easily disregard it. Sir WILFRID LAWSON says that he has felt the pulse of the working classes, and knows that they are enthusiastic upon this question. If they are not enthusiastic they could become so, and their enthusiasm might take a form which would oblige agitators to request the interference of the police. However, the division of last Wednesday guarantees the country against serious disturbance. Agitation for the Bill only expends ink. Agitation against a law founded on the Bill might easily produce bloodshed.

DEBTORS AND CHARITY.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL's proposal to apply certain charitable trusts which were originally intended for the relief of "indigent persons imprisoned for debt in metropolitan prisons" to the education of the children of convicts has given rise to a curious controversy as to whether there are not still some debtors to whom this relief may fairly be given. Vice-Chancellor BACON refused to sanction the scheme drawn up by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL on the ground that the object to which it was proposed to divert these funds did not come near enough to the original object for which they were left to satisfy the *cypres* doctrine, which has always been held in reverence in Chancery. When the object of a charitable endowment has utterly failed, it may be applied to quite a different object, as in the case of the old gift for the redemption of Christian captives in Barbary, which was ultimately used for the purpose of supporting and assisting charity schools in England and Wales. It is obvious that there is no sort of connexion between the ransom of kidnapped Christians and the education of charity children; but then there were no kidnapped Christians to be found in Barbary or anywhere else, and the Court of Chancery felt at liberty to bestow the money on any useful object that seemed to be in want of it. Before, however, the Court of Chancery will agree to such a transfer as this, it must be satisfied, not only that the original object of the charity has failed, but that no kindred object can be discovered. In the present instance Vice-Chancellor BACON held that it would surely be possible to find some other object more closely resembling the relief of imprisoned debtors than the education of convicts' children. He pointed out various objections to the ATTORNEY-GENERAL's scheme in itself—as, for example, that it was not desirable that children should grow up under a public badge of criminal parentage, and also that provision for the education of children of this class was already made in the Industrial Schools; but the main ground of his decision was that the scheme did not comply sufficiently with the *cypres* principle. He declined to make any specific proposal of his own, but he suggested that the relief of the sick and poor would not be very remote from the original object of the funds in question. It does not appear that Sir JAMES BACON gave any countenance to the idea that there were poor debtors in existence of the class originally contemplated by the testators; but it has since been contended in the *Times* that, in point of fact, the original object of the funds has not entirely failed, and that debtors in need of relief are still to be found in prison just as in former days. This assertion will startle those who were under the impression that one of the principal objects of the last Bankruptcy Act was to abolish imprisonment for debt, and it is worth while to examine the grounds upon which it rests.

In order to understand the point at issue, it is necessary to observe what imprisonment for debt really implied at the period when these charities were established. A debtor was then liable to be put in prison for the most trivial debt, and kept there until he paid it or died. It did not in the least matter whether his default arose from poverty or contumacy. Imprisonment was regarded not merely as a means of enforcing payment, but as a proper punishment for having got into debt, and a creditor who could not obtain his money was entitled, if he chose, to take his revenge. There can be no doubt that many creditors grossly abused this power, and imprisonment for debt became a monstrous instrument of cruelty and oppression. The law made no allowance for honest intentions or inevitable misfortune; it did not ask whether the debtor could not or would not pay. It was enough that he did not pay; and for that he was handed over to the mercy of his creditor,

who could lock him up for years, and even for life, if, as was probable, he had no means to pay his debts. To complete the picture it is necessary to remember what sort of places prisons were in those days, and the terrible reality of the phrase "to rot in gaol." It is impossible to exaggerate the utter wretchedness, degradation, and hopelessness of a debtor in prison, without friends, without the means of sustenance for himself and his starving family except such as his hard creditor chose to allow him. Even in comparatively recent days, after the darker aspects of prison life had been reformed, the debtors' prison was still a scene of great misery and suffering. It will readily be understood that, under these circumstances, humane and tender-hearted people could hardly find a more natural or appropriate object for their benevolence than the relief of poor debtors shut up in prison. It is quite true that there is still imprisonment for debt; but there are not, or at least by law there ought not to be, any destitute debtors in prison. It would be more correct to say that the Bankruptcy Act abolished imprisonment for inability to pay debts than that it abolished imprisonment for debt. Debtors are still liable to be put in prison, but only on the ground that they are able to pay their debts and yet will not pay them. We are not aware on what authority the *Times* makes the assertion that destitute persons, and even paupers in receipt of parish relief, are now imprisoned for debt, but certainly nothing can be more contrary to the express directions of the law. The fourth clause of the Act for the abolition of imprisonment for debt sets forth that, with certain exceptions, no person shall be arrested or imprisoned for making default in payment of a sum of money. The exceptions relate to default in payment of a penalty or sum recoverable summarily before a justice of the peace, default by a trustee who has been ordered by a Court of Equity to pay any sum under his control, default by an attorney to make any payment ordered by a Court, and default in payment for the benefit of creditors of any portion of a salary or other income, as to the payment of which a judicial order has been made. In regard to small debts, it is enacted that a debtor may be imprisoned only where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the person making default has, or has had since the date of the order or judgment, the means to pay the sum in respect of which he has made default, and has refused or neglected to pay the same. There can be no doubt, therefore, as to the meaning of the law. Whether the law is correctly interpreted in all cases is of course another question. If it can be shown that any judges of County Courts are in the habit of sending to prison destitute debtors, that may be a very good reason for calling for a more satisfactory administration of the law, but it is clear that the law itself is not to blame. It is perfectly certain that it is illegal to imprison debtors who are simply unable to pay their debts.

It is unnecessary to show how very different this is from the imprisonment of debtors under the old system. In point of fact, debtors are now imprisoned, not for inability to pay their debts, but for defrauding their creditors by refusing to pay debts when they have the means to pay them. It can hardly be seriously argued that people of this sort are a fit object for charitable relief. Just observe what would happen if this view were to be adopted. A man obtains and consumes a quantity of food and drink, and refuses, even when the debt has been proved against him, to pay for it. He is sent to prison, and at once becomes entitled to claim, as a reward for his misconduct, a gift of money from a charitable fund, to be spent, if he pleases, in further indulgence. If he had paid the bill, he would have been so much money out of pocket; as it is, he has not only succeeded in retaining the money due to his creditor, but has obtained a further sum as a premium on his dishonesty. It may be doubted whether, if this object of the law is to induce people to pay their debts, this object would be promoted by an arrangement of this kind. The *Times*, in a curious article in which the logic is all one way, and then by a sudden jerk the conclusion is twisted in an opposite direction, states the case very fairly. What, it asks, is to be done with a man who owes money, who can pay it, and does not choose to pay? The answer is—Let him go scot free, because "the great principles of modern legislation are imperious," and because English people have got into the habit of boasting that imprisonment for debt has been abolished. Upon this we have only to remark that there is no imperious principle of legislation that we are aware of in favour of granting impunity to roguery, and that it would be much safer to bring the habit of national boasting into accordance with the actual state of the law than to alter the law to suit a false and foolish boast. It will be seen that

there are two questions involved in this matter—first, whether debtors who are able to pay and will not pay should be imprisoned; and, secondly, whether, if they are to continue to be imprisoned, they are to be regarded as proper subjects for charitable relief. We dismiss the second of these questions as too preposterous for a moment's consideration; and we may remark in passing that Vice-Chancellor BACON seems to have forgotten that, if provision is made for convicts' children in industrial schools, provision is also made in the work-houses for the relief of the sick and poor. As to the other question, the *Times* itself has pointed out that practically there would be very little use in keeping up the County Courts unless they were armed with the power of imprisonment as a means of dealing with contumacious debtors who refuse to pay their debts, having the means to do so. Experience has shown that a very sparing exercise of the power is sufficient to produce a good effect on debtors generally. Shut up in prison a few debtors who can and will not pay, and other debtors at once begin to think they had better settle with their creditors. If it had been proposed to abolish all power of recovering small debts, there might have been some sense in it; but if an attempt is to be made to enforce the payment of small debts, it is an act of self-stultification to deprive the Courts of the only means of putting pressure upon debtors. "If," says the *Times*, "we punish a thief or a swindler, why may we not also punish a man who 'evidently can pay a debt, but who obstinately refuses to pay?' The common sense of the question contrasts oddly with the absurdity of the answer which the *Times* gives to it.

ANDREWS v. SALT.

WHATEVER may be thought of the prudence or of the liberality of the Roman Catholic Church in setting its face, as it has lately done, against mixed marriages, there can be no question that if its commands were obeyed the Court of Chancery would be saved a good deal of trouble. In the case of *ANDREWS v. SALT*, decided by the Lords Justices of Appeal on Tuesday, the Court had to investigate a twenty years' family history in order to determine whether an infant should be brought up as a Roman Catholic or as a Protestant. The deceased father, THOMAS ANDREWS, was a Roman Catholic; the mother, ELLEN ANDREWS, is a Protestant. Before their marriage THOMAS ANDREWS appears to have promised that, if the boys were brought up as Catholics, the girls should be brought up as Protestants; and if he had had the courage to keep his word, the aid of the Court of Chancery need never have been invoked. It is clear, however, that by the time a girl was born to him, which was not until the tenth year of his marriage, either his own conscience had become uneasy as to the propriety of allowing his daughter to be brought up as a Protestant, or, as is more probable, his mother, who had never been told of the arrangement with his wife, had begun to press him not to leave the child in the hands of heretics. At this time his mother's wishes had more than ordinary weight with him, since he had been prevented by ill health from carrying on his business, and he and his wife had thereupon gone home to their respective families. He did make some show of effort to get the child baptized by a Roman Catholic priest, but the effort was not determined enough to prevent the mother from acting upon her rights under the agreement, and having it baptized by an Anglican clergyman. THOMAS ANDREWS and his wife met shortly afterwards, and his family represent that he expressed great annoyance at what his wife had done. The wife, on the other hand, denies that there was any disagreement between them on the subject. The discrepancy may perhaps be reconciled by assuming that THOMAS ANDREWS did express annoyance at what his wife had done, but that he prudently expressed it, not to his wife, but to his mother. Some months later his wife returned to her parents, and, in her absence, THOMAS ANDREWS executed, two days before his death, a will by which he appointed his brother JOSEPH testamentary guardian of his two children, and directed that they should be brought up as Roman Catholics. It is not certain whether Mrs. ANDREWS was told of this will. At all events, neither she nor her brother-in-law took any steps to carry it out. THOMAS ANDREWS left nothing behind him, and, by a very natural arrangement, his son, who had hitherto lived with his father, continued to be supported by his father's relatives, while his daughter was supported by her mother's relatives. When the girl was nine years old the testamentary guardian thought it time to assert some right over her, and accordingly called upon her grandmother, Mrs. FLETCHER, with whom she was

then living, to give her up into his charge. This was in April 1871. The demand was at first refused, and afterwards yielded to. At the end of the same year, however, the child went on a visit to her grandmother, it being understood that she should return to her uncle in three weeks. When the time arrived the grandmother was not willing to send her back, and in the end a letter was written by the mother positively refusing to give up her daughter. Since that time—February 1872—the case has been successively before the Court of Queen's Bench, before Vice-Chancellor MALINS, and before the Lords Justices of Appeal. The Court of Queen's Bench held that the legal right of the testamentary guardian to the custody of the infant was indisputable. The VICE-CHANCELLOR held that there were sufficient reasons to induce the Court of Chancery to restrain the testamentary guardian from enforcing his legal right. The Lords Justices have now had to determine whether the order made in conformity with this view should be affirmed or rescinded.

The opinion of the Court of Appeal is the same as that of the VICE-CHANCELLOR. They set aside the claim of the testamentary guardian, and consign the child to the custody of her mother's relations. In former cases of this character the decision has often turned upon the injury resulting to the infant from a sudden and forced change of religious teaching. In this case this element was wanting. The Lords Justices have had the usual interview with the child, and they are of opinion that she "has not acquired the distinctive principles" of the Church of England to such an extent as to make it "wrong and cruel that she should be educated in the Roman Catholic religion." The points to be determined therefore were, first, what is the legal effect of an agreement made before marriage between a husband and a wife of different persuasions that boys should be educated in the religion of the father and girls in the religion of the mother. If such an agreement constitutes a binding contract, the testamentary guardian would in this case have no right to the custody of THOMAS ANDREWS's daughter. The Lords Justices hold that such an agreement does not constitute a legal contract. At first sight it may seem hard that a husband should be able to disown an arrangement into which he has voluntarily entered, and without assenting to which possibly he would not have gained his wife. But the Court of Chancery has to consider the consequences of taking upon itself to enforce a contract of this kind. In the last resort they would come to nothing less than this—that the Court would take a child from the custody of its own father, and compel him to pay for its education under guardians of a different religion from his own. If the Court is not prepared to go this length, it can do nothing really efficacious. Who is to decide what constitutes education in a particular religion. If a Protestant child lives in the house of a Catholic father, or if a Catholic child lives in the house of a Protestant father, how is the Court of Chancery to ensure its being educated in a religion which is not that of any other member of the family? If it were to insist upon the appointment of a tutor or governess of the religion in which it has to be agreed that the child shall be brought up, what guarantee could it ask that the influence of the tutor or governess shall not be counteracted by the influence of the father, or that in making choice of a tutor or governess the father shall not stipulate that their control of the child shall be merely nominal? Whatever moral force, therefore, an agreement of this kind may possess, it is impossible to invest it with any legal force. It is of the essence of a contract binding in law that it shall admit of being enforced by process of law; and a very cursory review of the difficulties which would attend such an attempt in the case of the education of children will show that an agreement on the part of a father to bring up children in a particular religion is wanting in this elementary condition.

The next point which the Lords Justices had to determine was whether the rights of the testamentary guardian had been barred by his neglect to assert them. The Lords Justices held that they were so barred, and considering that the guardian, knowing that the girl was being brought up a Protestant, acquiesced in this state of things from February 1863 to April 1871, they could not have come to any other conclusion. The case against the testamentary guardian was strengthened by the fact that the mother was in no way to blame for bringing up the child in her own way of thinking. There is nothing to show that she was acting against what she knew to be her husband's wish. On the contrary, she was acting in the spirit of an arrangement to which he had given his consent, and which he does not seem to have repudiated in any definite or unmistakable manner. After a husband has told his wife that their daughters are to be brought up in her re-

ligion, she may fairly require such an unmistakable repudiation before consenting to regard his promise as no longer in being. THOMAS ANDREWS knew that his daughter had been baptized by a clergyman of the Church of England, and this certainly constituted sufficient notice that his wife intended, if left to herself, to bring up the child as a Protestant. He took no steps however between May 1862 and February 1863 to prevent his wife from carrying out this intention, and though in the end he appointed his brother guardian of his daughter as well as of his son, and directed that she should be educated as a Roman Catholic, he did not tell his wife what he meant to do or lay any special injunction upon her not to resist his wishes. The guardian might have supplemented his brother's neglect by communicating the contents of the will to his sister-in-law, and insisting on her making arrangements for the education of the girl in her father's religion. Instead of this, he allowed her to remain under the charge of her mother and grandmother for eight years. Unless the rights of a testamentary guardian are held to be as indefeasible in equity as they are in law this conduct must be held to have forfeited them. With the pre-matrimonial agreement and the claim of the guardian thus got out of the way, the Court was free to consult the obvious interests of the child by allowing her to remain in the custody of the relations by whose bounty she has hitherto been maintained. It is satisfactory that a decision so consonant with the welfare of the person principally concerned should proceed on principles which give no cause for triumph to enthusiasts in either Church. The considerations which have led the Lords Justices to declare that the child shall be brought up as a Protestant would, under analogous circumstances, have led them by the same road to declare that she should be brought up as a Roman Catholic.

ALPHONSO'S WISH.

ALPHONSO the Tenth, King of Leon and Castile, enjoys a singular immortality as author of the celebrated wish that he had been consulted at the creation of the world. The form of the remark is rather profane; but a very large number of people re-echo the sentiment. Tell a reformer that his schemes are chimerical, and he will generally reply in substance, So much the worse for the fact. Just change the fundamental laws of human nature, he says, and war shall be abolished, crime disappear, and universal order reign amongst mankind. In other words, if only he had been consulted, the millennium would have begun a good many years ago. Passing over the form of the aspiration, we may perhaps say that it is not quite so ridiculous as appears at first sight. It may be as well at times to dwell in an ideal world, even if the conditions of our imaginary dwelling-place be such as can never be fully realized. Who knows, indeed, what changes may be possible in the coming years? Which are the unalterable laws of human nature, and which can be modified by judicious training? It is not easy to draw the line precisely. Perhaps, as science advances, we may discover that it is possible to change much that now appears to be irrevocably fixed. A wider knowledge of the laws by which the universe is moulded may give us powers of which at present it seems mere madness to dream. And though Utopia is a very unhealthy region considered as a permanent dwelling-place, occasional excursions within its borders may give a pleasant relief to the harsh realities of life, and may even at times lead us to some profitable suggestions. Even as a mere play of fancy such excursions may be amusing, and certainly imply no irreverence. The profanity does not consist in suggesting that men might have been in every way much better than they are, but in repining against the appointed evils of our lot. The fact that the world is not all that we could wish is only too palpable; and the error consists, not in admitting the fact, but in the absurd assumption that our wishes ought to have been exclusively consulted.

The ordinary mode of constructing Utopia is by imparting a little more wisdom and virtue to our "airy burgomasters," as Milton calls the citizens of Plato's Republic. In a humbler way we sometimes think how much might be done by a few physical alterations of no great difficulty, and which may conceivably be accomplished when Mr. Darwin's speculations have been carried to their legitimate result. Take, for example, one change which frequently occurs to us as desirable at concerts, in the House of Commons, and occasionally even in church. Human beings are so constructed as to be able to shut their eyes; and a man suddenly deprived of that power would be in danger of going mad. But why should not the same principle be applied to ears and noses? What an advantage any one would enjoy in the struggle for existence who could at will hermetically close all the avenues by which his senses are assailed and his mind distracted? The perorations of dreary orators, the piano in the next house, the strains of the organ-grinder in the street, would beat in vain against ears provided with a complete natural defence. People now close their eyes in order to concentrate their attention, especially upon a dull sermon; but a closing of the ears would be obviously a more effectual remedy against distraction, and would be less provocative of sleep. A man who could at a

moment's notice shut out all audible annoyances would carry his study about with him, and be able to sit down to work at a moment's notice in the midst of a crowded assembly. On the same principle, we always envy the hippopotamus when we see him rising from the water with his nostrils closely compressed. The power of smelling is undoubtedly useful, but it brings with it at least as many annoyances as pleasures. An inhabitant of London is assailed by more or less unsavoury odours during nine out of ten of his waking hours, in order that he may possibly enjoy the scent of a flower or the savoury forewarning of a good dinner during the tenth. It is no wonder that, under such circumstances, the power should have become enfeebled. To a dog the world doubtless presents itself as a collection of delicious scents, whilst the sights with which they are associated must be quite a secondary consideration. But human beings are disgusted by canine delicacies; and a sense which has brought so many pains in proportion to its pleasures is a possession of questionable advantage. If only we were capable of shutting out the disagreeable influences whilst laying ourselves open to the delicious ones, we might cultivate our sense of smell until it became as exquisite as that of the inferior animals. Or, again, it is obvious to remark upon the extreme inconveniences connected with the present mode of supplying teeth. Decay and accident reduce many of us to the condition of edentate animals before we have lived through half our natural term. The agonies which the race endures from toothache are probably as great on an average as the agony inflicted on a small minority by bullets and bayonets, and the mortality caused amongst infants by the process of cutting their first teeth is disastrously great. We are not, as we fully admit, in a position to suggest any better arrangement for masticating our food. Perhaps, as the intellectual predominates more decidedly over the animal nature, we shall ultimately do without teeth altogether, as it is said that some teeth are already apt to absent themselves from modern jaws. An improvement in cooking would necessarily accompany such a change, and civilization would be advanced in one of its most essential departments. There is, indeed, something rather disgusting to a philosophical mind about eating in general, and perhaps in a more refined age we shall be able to support ourselves entirely by smoking, or by some less gross method of assimilation. Meanwhile it is obvious to remark how great an advantage is possessed by some of the inferior animals. If, like rabbits, we had a constant supply of teeth steadily growing, instead of having to content ourselves with the niggardly allowance of two sets for our whole life, we should be free from many inconveniences. To make one more suggestion of a similar kind, is there not something very questionable about the present distribution of the human hair? When our great-grandfathers, the gorillas, took to rubbing off their natural garments from their bodies, in obedience, as it may be supposed, to some primitive laws of fashion, they were initiating a very questionable movement. The loss of tails had occurred at an early period, and probably deprived us of an appendage which would have been very convenient, and capable of much oratorical expression. But why should we have parted with our hair? and, still more, why should we have retained it in its present arbitrary positions? The naked skin of a pig is disgusting to our taste, and why not the naked skin of a human being? At any rate a beard, in spite of accidental associations, is so palpably awkward in its arrangement that a large part of mankind gets rid of it by artificial means. A whale finds a practical advantage in straining its food through a sieve inside its mouth; but to carry an external network upon which soup and other articles of consumption may leave greasy deposits is surely a flat contradiction to all common sense. A human being, one would have said, should have kept his mouth clear, whilst the rest of him should have been clothed with a fine coat of hair, or, better still, of feathers, which admit of an infinite variety of gorgeous colouring. Tailors' bills would have been saved; though it must be admitted that moulting would probably have been rather a disagreeable process.

The mention of feathers, however, suggests another point. Immense advantages might have been obtained if the leading order of creation had been developed, not out of monkeys, but out of birds. Many birds show an amount of intelligence equal to that of any of the terrestrial orders; and they possess powers which one would have thought would have been singularly useful in the development of civilization. At the present moment the most important material change to which we can look forward is that which would result from the contrivance of some practicable means of aerial travelling. If our remote ancestors had possessed that power from the earliest ages, they would by this time have reached a point of cultivation to which we can only look forward in the dim distance. Comparatively brainless as it is, a bird has attained some accomplishments which reduce us to despair. Everybody can sympathize with Shelley's description of the skylark, whose inarticulate music seems to express a greater fulness of joy than any which falls to the lot of weary humanity. What then would be the effect of giving to a skylark the brain of a Shelley? Should we not have strains of a poetry more ethereal than any which has ever greeted human ears? If indeed the question were between wings and hands, it is probable, as the result seems to have proved, that hands are on the whole the best of the two. But why should the vertebrates be condemned to possess only four limbs? The conventional angel is, we believe, an impracticable, though a singularly beautiful, form; but every vertebra is potentially de-

velopable into a limb; and, by a few judicious arrangements, it might surely have been possible to contrive a being which should combine the advantages of an eagle and a man. Perhaps, too, it may be worth asking whether Mr. Darwin's tidal animal did not make a mistake when it took to the land instead of the sea. A race of mermen would enjoy many indisputable advantages. They would live in a region of comparatively equable temperature; the comparative lightness of solid materials in water would enable them to raise structures incomparably grander than those which we have contrived in our thin atmosphere; and, instead of being partitioned off into separate continents, they would be able to form a cosmopolitan society spreading through the whole world. Birds and fishes share the advantage of this indifference to the barriers which divide our petty societies, and have the other indisputable advantage that, instead of being restricted to move along a plane, they naturally live, so to speak, in space of three dimensions. Vertical movement is to them nearly as easy as horizontal movement to us.

A further reflection is suggested by this. Might not the habitable earth have been arranged in far more convenient forms? Sir Charles Lyell has shown how much climate might be improved by altering the distribution, without altering the proportions, of sea and land. The speculations of philosophical historians again have shown how great an influence has been exercised upon civilization by the distribution of territory. The existence of vast continents has been unfavourable to the development of the higher forms of society. Suppose that they had been all broken up by inland seas skilfully arranged, might we not have had many repetitions of Greece and Italy instead of wildernesses of negroes and Australian savages? Should we not at the present day have been further advanced, and moreover protected effectually against that tendency to excessive centralization which is one of our modern dangers? Or again, whilst we are in the vein of speculating, might we not find a good deal to alter in the arrangements of the solar system, and indeed of the universe? Why should not the planets be within hail of each other? Why should matter be broken up into infinitesimal atoms distributed through the illimitable bounds of space, instead of being aggregated into one stupendous ball? Why—perhaps our speculations are a trifle chimerical, and it may be as well to stop in time.

One reflection, indeed, may be added. Perhaps, in space or time, all the conditions of which we speak may be verified. New forms of animal life and even of rational creatures may be developed; new arrangements of sea and land will be gradually brought about; and, as Mr. Herbert Spencer suggests in one of his boldest reveries, the planets will some day fall into the sun, the sun into some other star, and perhaps the whole material universe come together in one tremendous crash. This consummation, however, is not likely to take place just yet. Meanwhile the only use of such speculations, if they have any use, is to suggest how curiously limited are our notions of the universe, and what vast potentialities may be lurking in the world around us, of which we can take very little note. It never strikes us with any particular surprise that men should be formed just on that particular plan with which we are familiar and on no other; and yet, when one thinks of the infinite variety of modes in which matter might be combined, it somehow seems as if we ought to feel, if not surprise, yet a kind of wonder, at the special arrangement adopted, or at least at our incapacity for conceiving any other.

FELLOWSHIPS AND LIBERAL EDUCATION.

THERE is a notion abroad among the general public, not unfrequently encouraged by the unguarded language of persons who ought to know better, that college fellowships are a mere superfluous excrescence, not to say a mischievous encumbrance, on our present University system, and that as such they ought to be wholly abolished at no distant day. The impression which appears to prevail in the minds of most reformers who, on the strength of superficial acquaintance, take upon themselves to give good advice in this matter, is to the following effect. A college fellowship is a money prize of inordinate value, in the shape of an annuity of indefinite duration, given for proficiency in the very studies for which the University degree ought alone to be a sufficient encouragement and reward. It is a wasteful bounty for which no one gets any return; and the funds now absorbed in this way by a certain number of fortunate individuals ought to be appropriated to the payment of working teachers, so as to give the benefit of them to the whole body of students by making the general course of University education better, cheaper, and more extensive than it is at present.

Now it may be conceded at once that, notwithstanding the partial improvements made by the last University Commission, the tenure of fellowships is still far from being in a wholly satisfactory condition. No one can be more keenly aware of this than the resident members of some of the leading colleges, who have been giving their best efforts to devise means for reconstituting their several polities on a right and reasonable footing; efforts which, however, are likely enough to be superseded by the wisdom of Parliament, stimulated perhaps by impatient ignorance outside Parliament, unless in the course of the next year or two it should come to be more generally perceived that in dealing with the constitutions of colleges, as well as of States, it is worth while to understand them before you demolish them. The popular view,

as we fear we must call it, of the inutility of fellowships, which we believe we have not unfairly expressed, is such a view as is naturally taken by observers of otherwise competent intelligence who do not give themselves any trouble to understand the actual working of somewhat complex and anomalous arrangements, finding it more pleasant, and indeed more effective, to be content with roundly stated generalities. For our own part, we do not profess omniscience even within the limits of English Universities; and the remarks we are about to make are to be taken as applying chiefly to Cambridge. Only when we find that sweeping and indiscriminate charges are not borne out by the facts in that part of the case of which we have some actual knowledge, we are led to entertain a strong suspicion that they are not likely to be much more correct in the rest.

So far, then, as our knowledge goes, these charges in their usual unqualified form are at least exaggerated and misleading. It is not generally true that a fellowship is a mere prize for University studies. The college does generally get some return for it, even if not in the shape of teaching; and, further, in a considerable proportion of cases a fellowship does practically become a direct payment for valuable work done in University education.

In the first place, the criticism is sometimes heard that the University examinations for honours involve a danger of cramping the course of reading within too rigidly defined limits, and sacrificing the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake to what may be called the examination-faculty. The danger is real, and it is good to be reminded of it whether by friends or foes. And if the state of a man who resides after his degree in the hope of a fellowship were merely a continuation of his state immediately before his degree, this would no doubt be a grave objection to the institution. But the fact is that fellowships, so far from aggravating the vices attendant on the system of awarding University honours, act in some ways as a corrective of them. A man who has just taken a good degree is in possession of at least some of the chief instruments of a liberal education, and has learnt to manipulate them with considerable skill; but it is an exceptional case if at this stage the actual knowledge he has acquired in the use of them bears anything like a due proportion to the technical training which has hitherto occupied so much of his time. Before he throws himself for good and all into whatever is to be the principal business of his life, he still wants an interval to complete the furniture of his mind by study of a freer, larger, and more independent sort. We do not say that the state of things we describe is good in itself, or that it may not be desirable and possible to revise the whole plan of University education so as to mitigate it; but there is no doubt that, so long as the general plan remains what it is—and there are very few signs just now of any change either from within or from without—men who reside for some little time after their University examinations are over are decidedly the better for it. It would be hardly too much to say that there is often more fruitful and liberal education in the work a man does in the year after his degree than in all he has done in the three years before it. But what is to keep him at his college for that year? It is obvious that few men can afford to give up time to the improvement of their minds for its own sake at an age when there is every temptation to make sure of an early start in the race for this world's goods. To most it would be in all material respects a dead loss. Those who are enlightened enough to need no positive inducement to fill up the shortcomings in permanent value of reading which took no thought beyond the examination of the morrow may be quite unable to do so without an indemnity. It is the prospect of a fellowship which meets this want by keeping on the spot for a short but valuable season the men who are most likely to profit by it. It does not matter so very much whether any special direction is given to their work; the main thing is that it is done out of harness, so to speak, and without the constant vision of a competitive scale of marks. But the conditions of election, at one college at least of no mean rank, are such as to distinctly favour a more free development of individual excellence than is possible under the yoke of the Tripos. Thus a fellowship is something more than a mere prize added to the honours of a high degree. It is a security for the continuance of liberal studies which would otherwise be unprofitable. Fellowships are sometimes stigmatized as rewards for useless knowledge. It is just because the higher branches of learning are useless—that is, have no immediate money value except to the few who mean to make teaching their profession—that they require artificial encouragement. Such encouragement is but partially and inadequately given by the general University course, and the fellowships help to supply it. It is true that the want ought not to exist, and it ought not to be beyond the skill of University reformers to devise a remedy. But in the meantime we do find, as an integral part of the existing machinery, this institution which provides a kind of compensation, roughly and almost by accident, if you will, for certain glaring defects; there is ample scope for reforming and improving it in detail, and the task of doing so is comparatively simple; but it cannot be wholly abandoned without putting something in its place; and if we make up our minds to dispense with it, we must also be prepared to remodel the whole structure.

Next, let us see whether a college may not derive some appreciable benefit from even its non-resident Fellows who do no specific work for it. It is a mistake to suppose that a non-resident Fellow has absolutely nothing to do but to pocket his dividends. While he remains a member of the collegiate body he is entitled to take an active interest in its affairs, and may have

a voice in its government. It is true that there are at present no means of enforcing the attendance of non-residents at college meetings; but it is found, at any rate in the college which is chiefly in our mind, that non-resident Fellows do for the most part attend college meetings pretty regularly, and that their presence contributes a very useful element. They help to multiply the points of contact with the outer world, and to preserve the resident body from the narrowness and isolation of which there is always a certain danger. As for the assumption, which we have seen quietly made in a leading article on this subject, that the business done at college meetings is merely formal, we can only say that it is wholly mistaken. It is to be observed that the tenure of non-resident fellowships, though in theory not limited to a fixed term of years, is practically kept within bounds by the terms on which the fellowships are held. Most fellowships are held on condition of remaining unmarried, and many on condition of taking orders within a certain time. These conditions, though not originally intended for any such purpose, act in a rough way to prevent the stagnation which would ensue without them. They work, however, imperfectly and capriciously, and public opinion has widely grown in favour of replacing them by a short and certain tenure in the case of Fellows holding no college office.

In the case of working residents their operation is not only less convenient than it might be, but in various ways positively obstructive. For a working college officer has to look to his fellowship for a considerable part of his payment. It is true that tutors and lecturers do receive additional emoluments, but no one acquainted with the subject will say that they are on the whole overpaid. The fellowships held by working college officers are in fact utilized to their full extent as payments for work actually done. But the inconvenient conditions attached to them have been but very partially relaxed by recent legislation; and men are naturally unwilling to enter upon a profession hampered with such conditions. This is one of the chief reasons for the difficulty, now much complained of, found in securing a sufficient proportion of the rising generation of Fellows for the teaching staff of the colleges. At present they have very little inducement to stay. Even those who are disposed to make education their profession can generally do much better as schoolmasters than as college lecturers.

These defects might obviously be remedied without losing any of the good points of the present system or making any violent change in the constitution of either colleges or Universities. At the same time it may be reasonably doubted whether the abolition of tests in the Universities has so far reduced them to the condition of lay institutions that their function of contributing a learned clergy to the Established Church should be repudiated. Clerical fellowships may be somewhat difficult to fit into an educational system; but they need not therefore be pushed aside as an anomaly and an inconvenience. They also supply an acknowledged want, though of another kind. The ordinary tenure of fellowships apart from college offices should be limited to a short fixed term of years. The working residents should be provided for by emoluments commensurate with their work, and held on such terms as to induce them to look on it as a permanent profession. Perhaps it is of no great importance whether an extended tenure of their fellowships is conferred on them by that name or not; but any provision which is made must have that effect in substance, and we see no reason why the name should be lost. There is no doubt that it is possible to frame a reasonable and satisfactory scheme of this kind; nevertheless we do not suppose any such plan would be likely to satisfy those who contemplate some large and undefined project of University reform wholly inconsistent with the existing constitution of the English Universities. When any such project takes a definite shape it will be time to see whether it is so good as to make it worth while to abolish what we have already. In the meanwhile it appears to us that on many points relating to University education, and notably on this particular matter of fellowships, much of the partial criticism now afloat is unfair and misconceived.

Since the preceding observations were written a memorial has been presented to Mr. Gladstone from Cambridge on this subject, and is acknowledged in his reply to be an "important document, which sets forth the views of a large and weighty part of the residents of Cambridge." The proposals of the memorial coincide in substance with the suggestions we have advanced, and it is satisfactory to see that they have been well supported, and that there is hope of their receiving due attention in any general plan that may be brought forward.

THE TIMES AND THE ARTISTS.

THE *Times* has just been moved to address an earnest exhortation, or rather remonstrance, to the artists of the day. It is not at all disposed to share the gloomy despondency of the *Quarterly Review* as to the present condition of English art. The *Quarterly* holds that the work of our painters bears witness to our incapacity for all elevated thought, and fears that "we shall be known to succeeding generations as belonging to an age in which almost every spark of the epic and heroic had been quenched in the grave of a hopeless materialism." The *Times*, on the other hand, is satisfied that "only an inveterate depreciator of his contemporaries will deny that there is a steady improvement in the general character of the works submitted to the public judgment." What distresses the *Times* is, not a deficiency of artistic power, but the disposition of artists to waste their time, colours, and canvas

either on historical incidents of a remote period, or on subjects of the day which do not fall within the scope of ordinary newspaper paragraphs. "What," it asks, "is the world in which the painters live?" Don't they read the *Times*? don't they even take in a penny paper? If they do, there is no trace of it on the walls of the Academy. For all that appears there, "the history of our own time might as well never have been written." What the *Times* seems to have expected to see on the walls of the Academy was a reflex of its own columns, and it is naturally shocked to find that "our artists live in a world of their own, a professional fairy-land"—quite beyond the reach of morning or even evening papers—"whither no sound of the actual, moving, heaving world without can come, and in which the dramas which change the face of the Old World and the New are quite unknown." For a moment we might fancy that the *Times* and the *Quarterly* are at one, for the former goes on to declare that "if Art"—by the way, has it been observed that the late Lord Lytton seems to have made a testamentary disposition of all his capital letters to the *Times*?—"is not to be entirely divorced from human life in its grandest and most tragic developments, the traditions of our British school must be at fault." We doubt, however, whether the writer in the *Quarterly* would agree with the writer in the *Times* that the Art of an age should be "correlative with its public life," and it is possible that he might not receive very respectfully the suggestion that the aid of photography should be sought in order to illustrate "English national history."

The *Times*, it seems, has no objection to "well-painted landscapes," or "clever illustrations of poetry or fiction or bygone history," or even an "idyllic representation of English life." There is no harm in these things, and they may be tolerated up to a certain point. But surely it is deplorable that "the most interesting incidents of a most interesting age should pass away without a record," and that the leading articles and special correspondence of a great journal should receive no artistic illustration on the walls of a fashionable exhibition of pictures. And then the *Times* goes on to enumerate some of the subjects which it would have been glad to see transferred from its columns to canvas—"armies by the million in the field," "entire hosts carried into captivity," "the most beautiful capital in Europe doomed to the flames by its own desperate defenders," "a war of unprecedented obstinacy"—the writer has never perhaps heard of the Thirty Years' War, or even of the Crimean War, or the Civil War in America—"and devastation softened by admirable displays of religious zeal and true philanthropy." All this means, we suppose, when put into plain language, the march of the German armies, the surrender of Sedan, the feats of the *pétroleuses* during the Commune, and the convivial adventures of the nondescript people who lived at ease and wrote newspaper correspondence under pretence of nursing the sick and wounded. Artists are also invited to depict "the social changes which have transformed the Russian Empire and the American Republic," and "our own busy political life, with all its noble and dignified, its grotesque and humorous incidents." This seems to point, as far as our country is concerned, to pictures of the Irish Church Bill in Committee of the whole House; Mr. Cardwell explaining the details of his Army scheme to a sullen military audience, gradually dropping off into peaceful slumber under his soporific eloquence; Mr. Whalley asking questions about the Pope and the Tichborne Claimant, and being called upon for a song; and those other "grotesque and humorous incidents" which many persons think have been sufficiently commemorated in the *Happy Land*. As for the "social changes" of the American Republic, the shooting of Colonel Fisk might perhaps furnish materials for a thrilling picture, although the doubts of the citizens of New York as to whether it would not be ungrateful to hang the murderer would supply a still more suggestive subject to an artist capable of doing it justice. An historical panorama of the varied scoundrelism of the Erie Ring would certainly possess a curious interest of its own, but after all we are hardly disposed to join with the *Times* in deploring that these great events should be neglected in "the Art of the period."

The only reason which occurs to the *Times* why events of the day are not eagerly seized upon by painters is, that, "there is in England a strong liking for what is nice and agreeable," and that there might be supposed to be a difficulty in treating the "social changes" of Russia and the United States, and our own "busy political life," in this manner. The *Times*, however, has so much faith in the innate propriety and decorum of British artists, that it is quite confident they could portray "the great events of the day" in an aspect at once truthful and picturesque, and at the same time nice and agreeable. Indeed so unbounded is its confidence in this respect, that it believes that even a picture of the Congress of Geneva might be made "nice and agreeable." The *Times* is quite surprised that no English artist has given us the Arbitration of Geneva, which, it says, is "likely to be memorable in the world if the principle of Arbitration"—big A of course—"be generally adopted on the strength of its example." We are quite ready to admit that it will be memorable, even if the principle is not generally adopted, and perhaps most memorable if it should turn out to be an example scrupulously avoided; but still we have our doubts about its suitability for artistic treatment. The *Times*, we are afraid, when it made this rash suggestion, can hardly have reflected on the possible consequences of inciting English artists to venture upon a representation of this historical scene. It has been authoritatively stated that the only object of the arbitration was to please the Americans; and the English

member of the Tribunal of Geneva has been rebuked by at least one member of the English Government for discussing the legal bearings of the judgment lest his remarks should ruffle our very sensitive friends. It is quite conceivable that an English painter might produce a picture of the Congress which might not give satisfaction on the other side of the Atlantic, and all the good of the arbitration would thus be neutralized. On the other hand, an English artist might find some difficulty in doing justice on canvas to Mr. Caleb Cushing's graphic descriptions of the great event from the American point of view. Count Sclopis's "large stature, dignified presence, high breeding of rank, but without pretentiousness," Mr. Staempfli's "piercing dark eyes and jet black hair," and Viscount Itajuba's "fair complexion and air of gentleness and amiability," might not be beyond the resources of art; but we are afraid there is no living painter who could adequately portray Chief Justice Cockburn's "tendency to declamatory denunciation of adversary opinion," "biliousness of temper, prolixity, disrespect to the Tribunal, negligence, disingenuousness, fault-finding, imputations of bad motives, and other peculiarities." A painter might indeed endeavour to depict Sir Alexander "disappearing like a criminal escaping from the dock," but this would not be enough unless he also brought out the concentrated malignity and turpitude of Mr. Cushing's pet aversion. On the whole, we have some reason perhaps to be thankful that the painters have let the Congress of Geneva alone, and also that they have had the good taste to avoid the agonies of the battle-field and the lurid horrors of revolutionary incendiarism. Another of the *Times*'s suggestions is that India offers a fine field for the painter, especially as he can now command the assistance of photography. We suppose that this means that an artist who has a good collection of photographs of Indian scenes and figures need not trouble himself to visit the country, and the hint is certainly quite in keeping with the rest of the article. Nobody can doubt that India offers a noble field to an artist capable of turning his opportunities to account, but it may be doubted whether pictures in Zoffany's style are not sufficiently represented by the woodcuts in the illustrated papers. Although the *Times* spells art with a capital letter, it seems to take a very low view of its aims and functions. Art, in its true sense, has an end of its own apart from the dissemination of useful information as to foreign countries and the pictorial record of current events. It is natural, of course, that people should like to have pictures of the battle of Sedan, the sittings of the Congress of Geneva, Paris in flames, the House of Commons on the night of a great debate, and similar subjects, but it can hardly be said that the supply does not keep pace with the demand. The *Times* has only committed the mistake of looking for it in the wrong place. There is no lack of illustrations of national life taken hot and hot while the events are fresh in everybody's recollection, and very good illustrations they are too in their way, only they have not yet found their way into the Academy. There are good reasons, if the *Times* could only understand them, why it is not desirable that art should enter into competition with the penny-a-liner, or even try to emulate the glorious achievements of "Our Own Correspondent."

If anything could make us hopeless about English art, it would be the prevalence of the sort of notions as to the scope and objects of art which are expressed in such an article as this, and which no doubt meet with the approbation of many worthy people. Measuring English art, not by its highest works, but by the majority of pictures, there has undoubtedly been a decided advance in mechanical skill. Every year there is a larger number of pictures of average merit and commonplace excellence, but the decline, not only in intellectual purpose, but even in mere technical aims, is almost equally conspicuous. The blame, however, does not rest so much with artists as with their patrons. Even without being sordidly mercantile, an artist is naturally influenced by the tastes and desires of the people who buy pictures, and there are "pot-boilers" of all degrees of merit. In a generation of rich men destitute of intellectual culture or artistic perceptions, and given over to the indulgence of mere personal vanity, it is not surprising that art should reflect the narrowness and triviality of its most profitable customers. What the wealthy patron of art wants is to surround himself with portraits of himself and his family, and with other pictures that respond to the narrow range of their tastes and intelligence. Hence it is that wherever you turn in the Exhibition you see the same dull level of commonplace prettiness and self-complacent mediocrity. Nothing can be more poor and trivial, as well as hackneyed, than the majority of the subjects chosen for delineation. It is a doubtful point whether artists do well to take their subjects from books; but if they will go to books for subjects, they might at least be expected to extend their course of reading a little. Here we have all the familiar characters and incidents trotted out year after year—Lear and Cordelia, Prince Arthur and Hubert, the Lady of Shallott, Lord William and Lady Russell, the Eve of St. Bartholomew, Peppys, Chatterton, Dr. Johnson in Bolt Court, and all the rest of our old friends. This year, however, we are thankful to say nobody has found the body of Harold, and we have not been able to discover even a single scene from the *Vicar of Wakefield*. The test of a good picture is, of course, that it shall convey a distinct, definite idea worth carrying away; but there are hardly half-a-dozen pictures in the whole Academy that can be said, even to approach to satisfying this demand, or that indicate the faintest perception on the part of the artist that it requires to be satisfied. It is true that a painter, like a poet, will never do much who

does not draw his inspiration from the age in which he lives, but it does not follow that he should devote himself, as the *Times* suggests, to the illustration of contemporary history with the assistance of photography. Almost from the nature of the case, contemporary history is opposed to artistic treatment of a high order, in which the ideal must always be largely mingled. An artist must study humanity for himself as it exists under his eyes; but he must also be on his guard against allowing his view to be disturbed or discoloured by the passions, prejudices, or caprices of the hour. Passing events are too large to be brought within the focus of true art; and the medium through which they are seen is almost necessarily fatal to artistic insight and impartiality. The reason why battle pieces belong to such a low phase of art is simply that the natural suggestiveness of the subject outruns the artist's efforts, and the same may be said of most of the incidents of current history. There is no reason, however, why, while leaving topics of the day as hitherto to the ready pencils of the illustrated papers, artists should not endeavour to rise to the contemplation of everyday life in its higher aspects. There is surely more to be found in

This live, throbbing age,
That brawls, cheats, maddens, calculates, aspires,
And spends more passion, more heroic heat,
Betwixt the mirrors of its drawing-rooms
Than Roland with his Knights at Roncesvalles,

than the mere boudoir prettinesses and nursery benedictions which compose the stock of this year's pictures. There are sterner, nobler, more heroic, and more spiritual aspects of life which should hardly be ignored; and it is here that we come upon the most serious deficiency of modern art.

CITY CHURCHES.

THE old question of the ecclesiastical condition of the City of London with its numerous churches and its diminished population has again been brought before Parliament. A measure bearing the vague and misleading title of "Union of Benefices Bill" struggled through a Select Committee of the House of Lords last year, and then reached the Commons too late to be seriously entertained. It has during the present Session been introduced into the Lower House; and, after having been again handled by a Select Committee, is now awaiting the further consideration of a Committee of the whole House, if it escapes a direct opposition from Mr. Candlish, apparently prompted by the belief that it is a measure calculated to be of some practical benefit to the Church. The Bill itself is in its form one merely to amend the existing Act of 1860 as to the procedure necessary for carrying out a foregone conclusion, by transforming a series of separate Commissions—named in each case by the Bishop of London, but always composed of the same men—by whose advice City livings are now united, into a single body, stiff for a few years with official dignity and Parliamentary recognition, and by doing away with some preliminary sanctions which have hitherto happily, or unhappily, checked the rapid working of the measure. Still the introduction of this Bill has virtually stirred up again the whole question of the policy of pulling down City churches and of consolidating the benefices. No one indeed absolutely denies the lawfulness or the expediency of making some reduction in their number; but the distance between a grudging acceptance of the theoretic case and a strong belief in its practical value may involve the whole difference between the pious desire of solemnly pigeon-holing the measure and the fervid determination to convert it into an engine of ecclesiastical revolution. We are satisfied to stand by and to attempt to disentangle some of the difficulties of a very perplexed case.

Prima facie eighty-six parish churches were an excessive allowance for the City before the Fire of 1666; and the fifty-one to which they were cut down in consequence of that event, and of which all but a few are still standing, may be accepted as excessive now. We may also admit the truism that if the very valuable sites of the superfluous churches could be turned into money, a large fund would be available for new churches in places in which they are now sadly wanted. If, then, there were no consideration involved beyond the ratios of the actual population of the City to the sittings in those churches, and of those sittings to the number of their occupants at eleven o'clock every Sunday morning, we might very safely accept a scheme of sweeping demolition, and of a large transaction in church building elsewhere. But against this merely arithmetical view of the matter a host of objections, political, social, moral, sentimental, practical, and artistic present themselves, which we shall briefly run over. We need not be stopped by the primary objection to any demolition at all of a once consecrated building as a sacrilegious act. Churches have been so often, and in all lands, altered, removed, or altogether blotted out, that it is idle to set up the feeling as a rule of action. It is, no doubt, a pious instinct, and one worthy of all respect, to shrink from tampering with buildings devoted to sacred uses for no good reason, or for merely a selfish one; and, so far, the Commissioners under the Bill will be on a stricter trial at the bar of public opinion than a mere Improvement Board would be. The conditions of that complex body the Church of England, to which these buildings appertain, give more practical reasons for moving cautiously. Each of these churches has its incumbent, and it represents at least one parish, with its compact knot of parishioners, parish officers, vestry, and that whole category

of duties, responsibilities, privileges, advantages, and associations, social and administrative as well as religious, which gather round an old English parish. Many of them represent two or three such parishes; for at the one moment when a sweeping concentration would have been possible, it was neglected; and although London was rebuilt after the Fire with a diminished tale of churches and a reduced list of clergy, the old exuberance of small parishes, with their separate vestries, parish officers, and organizations, was retained, and must, as even the more moderate advocates of further demolition are forced to admit, be still kept up, for civil considerations.

The Bill itself says as much in its title, of one for the union and not for the consolidation of benefices. Let it pass, and let St. Stephen's, Walbrook, and Bow Church fall under its axes and hammers, the parishes which own these names will still exist in the same condition of invisible immortality as those of St. Anne Zachary, St. Mary Moles, or St. Martin Pomeroy. This at once limits the question to a series of comparatively narrow issues; for, the old parochial divisions being still a necessity, the fate of each church and of its parson has in each case to be settled on its own merits, on the one side being the value of the church where it is, and of its clergyman, and on the other, the good which may be got elsewhere by the money value of the one and of the other. It is in fact the universal question of squaring and levelling which the bewildered world is now so busy in codifying. The arrangement is further complicated by the City parishes being of two distinct classes, corresponding with the division, so generally forgotten, of the City itself into the portion within the walls (the City proper) and that without (the old Liberties). In fact the City itself, small as it seems on any map of the capital, represents not only the town but the suburbs of the middle ages. As might be supposed, the parishes within the walls are very small, and those without much larger. If the small parishes were unduly rich, and the populous ones of the Liberties very poor, an admirable opportunity would be afforded for one of those rough and ready reforms in which Commissioners rejoice. But unluckily London within the walls roughly represents the area of the Great Fire, and from this a further result ensues. The tithe of all the City was regulated under an Act of Henry VIII. at the high figure of 2s. 9d. in the pound, and at this it has been commuted in the parishes which were not burnt. But in those which happen to have been rebuilt after the Fire, it was replaced under an Act of Charles II., commonly called the Fire Act, by a rent-charge, which although augmented under an Act of about the beginning of the present century, still represents small stipends. So the big parishes are rich and the little parishes are poor, and the process of chopping and changing is proportionately difficult. During the halcyon days of pluralities and non-residence no one of course thought of the grievance, for there was probably no City incumbent who had not some other living elsewhere.

Now, however, the question has presented itself under the aspect not only of this apparent plethora of church provision in the City, but of that of very general non-residence, arising not only from the temptation which undoubtedly exists for the clergyman to live out of the City, but from the fact of the great augmentation of income which he can derive from letting the site of the parsonage for commercial uses; and so for about twenty years the question has been discussed, legislated on, re-discussed, and re-legislated about. The one point on which all parties seem agreed is to get as much of the spoil as they can for their own particular use; and here we are confronted with the impossibility of defining the order of the different claims. A parish is a civil no less than a religious institution, and the church may be said to partake of the double nature of the parish itself. On the other hand, London, while in one sense a single town, is in another sense a province of houses. Even in its ecclesiastical character it cannot claim unity, partitioned as it is between the sees of London, Winchester, and Rochester. So that after your church has been condemned, it will be the most difficult thing in the world to decide what had best be done with it. The lay parishioner appeals to a patriotism which need not be despicable because it operates within a narrow area; and pleads that, if necessity compels the destruction of the church which, to him at least, was both useful and a source of legitimate pride, he should first be indemnified by some improvement of his schools, by some enlargement of his narrow streets, and by some alleviation of those local burdens which exist for purposes akin to charity. In much agreement with him, the clergyman and the City man generally can well point to the separate and distinctive character of the old incorporated City of London as contrasted with the loosely jointed "Metropolis," and claim that at least the wants of the poorer alleys of the populous parishes of the "Liberties"—Holborn, Cripplegate, Shoreditch, Whitechapel—should be thought of before Westham, Peckham Rye, or Holloway. Why not, he may argue, re-arrange the City parishes within the limits of the City, and of those parts of the town which are distinctly purloined of the City? Why not find a *raison d'être* for some of the churches whose actual pastoral duties have shrunk to nothing by assigning to them districts outlying indeed, but within a few minutes' walk of Cheapside or Cornhill? This plea is strengthened by the fact that several of the City churches, which upon the hard parochial principle might appear to have collapsed, have really become, under a more expansive system and in the hands of earnest clergymen, centres of church life. Among them we need only name St. Lawrence Jewry, so long the post of the recently created

Dean of Manchester. Why not also, remembering that non-residence is the crying evil, provide that the first lien on the accruing fund should be a convenient parsonage bought or built for those incumbents who are left? Another class of claimants, armed with antagonistic demands, are the residuary Londoners, with their ecclesiastical chiefs. No doubt churches are much wanted in the suburbs, and if a sum of money should be let loose by the destruction of some church in Laurence Pountney Lane, it would clearly be well disposed of in building another church at Camberwell, Barking, or Hammersmith. But we do not see that the church needs of Camberwell, Barking, or Hammersmith are in themselves a reason why churches should be pulled down in Laurence Pountney Lane, except on principles which might, if more generally applied, lead to rather troublesome results. The Committee of the House of Commons showed its appreciation of this reasoning by striking the nominees of the Bishops of Winchester and Rochester out of the list of Commissioners, while permitting those prelates to have a voice in the distribution of the contingent spoil.

We have purposely left out of sight—because we fear that it has been hopelessly shelved by the drift of the question—the most obvious and the least revolutionary reform in the condition of the livings of the City proper, which might have been at one time possible, and to which indeed the present Archbishop of Canterbury called attention in the Charge which he gave as Bishop of London in 1858:—

I am aware that you cannot make men learned by giving them leisure for study; but it is certain that it is very difficult for them to become learned without it. Now, since the principal part of the revenues of this Cathedral has been appropriated by Parliament to other purposes, we must be contented if we find anywhere amongst us such situations as may advantageously be held by clergymen of studious habits without their neglecting any direct calls of practical duty. We want also situations in which men who, from advancing age or other circumstances, are not equal to the toil of an overwhelming parish, may pass their time more quietly, but not, therefore, less usefully for the Church; aiding by their advice and quiet example when they can no longer endure the tear and wear of that incessant public life in which the pastor of an overgrown parish is involved. In an age of much excitement, amid the din of perpetual outward activity, we more than ever require to have some quiet spots. Now, as a matter of fact, our City parishes in their present state in some degree at least meet our wants in these particulars. We are glad to point amongst our City clergy to names well known for learning, and we have quiet influences emanating from the City which will sooner or later be felt over the whole diocese and the whole Church. I would in no wise do away with, I would strive by every means to foster, this peculiarity of our present ecclesiastical arrangements.

The revenues of St. Paul's, as the Archbishop points out, have been otherwise appropriated. This is equivalent to stating what we have ever urged, that the Cathedral is the complement of the parochial system, and that as canonries proper are no longer available in London, as they might have been, for the manifold needs of the Anglican Church in that which is really its principal centre, these City livings, properly handled, might have filled up the gap, particularly as they possess a virtual chapter in Sion College. A large proportion of them are already in the patronage of those who might have helped on so good and useful a work—that is, of the Bishop of London, of St. Paul's Cathedral, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Lord Chancellor, and a judicious exchange of patronage might easily have swept more in. Mindful, however, of the proverb touching spilt milk, we pass on.

We have reserved to the last the architectural question. The very completeness of the victory which Gothic has achieved as the ecclesiastical style should make us more careful not to sweep ruthlessly away, nor yet to mutilate, so noble and elaborate a series of examples of the other great school of constructive art applied to sacred purposes as now exists in the City churches by Wren and his pupils, nor to thin that forest of varied steeples which so gracefully group themselves before the loiterer on London Bridge. The original Act contained a not well chosen list of four exempted churches, one of them being excepted because London Stone was embedded in its wall. A motion to enlarge this list in the present Bill so as to include all the really valuable churches of the City was lost in the Committee, and the question as it stands is left to the good sense of the yet unnamed Commissioners, subject to the instruction inserted at the same time in the preamble, "due regard being had to the preservation of churches of architectural and historical interest." The difficulty on which was wrecked that which would in itself have been the safest and most explicit procedure, was how to frame the list so as both to include churches which never ought to be pulled down, but which are still in jeopardy, and also not to seem indifferent to the eventual fate of others which ought to be equally sacred, but which seem at present too safe to require artificial protection. To give a few examples. No one but a lunatic Commissioner would now propose to pull down the stately St. Andrew's, Holborn, or that majestic fragment of a great Romanesque minster, St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield. What, on the other hand, should we do with the historical St. Magnus, Fish Street Hill, one of Wren's choicest conceptions, and the living monument of that great chapter of our history, the Danish invasions? This church seems safe, but it is not quite secure. On the other hand, there is a cluster of five nearly adjacent churches in the innermost heart of the City, the demolition of any one of which would be a Vandalism, but each one of which has been repeatedly menaced. St. Michael's, Cornhill, with a noble Gothic tower by Wren, and a body gorgeously recast by Sir Gilbert Scott, with Rogers's finest wood carvings and Clayton and Bell's most carefully painted glass, stands very close to St. Peter's in the same street,

the traditional successor of the oldest church in London, with a very picturesque spire, and an interior fitted up with more than usual care by Wren himself. The demolition of either of those churches would be an act of barbarous stupidity; so would be that of Wren's one completely Gothic church with a tower hardly inferior to that of St. Michael's, St. Mary Aldermary, now standing clear on the line of the new Queen Victoria Street. St. Michael's, too, and St. Mary Aldermary, have shown vigorous symptoms of revived spiritual activity; so also have the two adjacent churches of St. Edmund the King in Lombard Street, and of St. Mary Woolnoth, at the corner of Lombard and King William Streets. The last-named church is nothing less than an historical monument, being recognized as the *chef-d'œuvre* of Wren's greatest pupil—of whom so few works survive—Hawksmoor. Yet the General Post Office has long been hankering after its site in order to extend a branch office. We need not multiply our instances. The Committee, we think, might have been more bold in handling the question. At all events, however, it has shown by its addition to the preamble that it looked with no favour upon the Vandalism which would ruthlessly topple down churches well deserving of the reverential care of a civilized community in order to meet the indefinite claims of ill-defined suburbs. We can only trust that the Commissioners, whoever they may be, will lay to heart this monitory instruction. If they neglect it they will very certainly find their tenure of office a troublesome time.

COURIERS FOR VIENNA.

MR. LEVER'S wandering hero in *Arthur O'Leary* is magnificently entertained by a mysterious stranger who displays a marvellous acquaintance with men and things, who has an unparalleled gift of tongues, who is as much a connoisseur in art as in cookery, and who serves him a sumptuous little supper on wonderfully chased plate in a little *salon* hung with gems of the rarest masters. In course of conversation it comes out that the gentleman who thus entertains Mr. O'Leary in the Low Countries has his cottage on the shores of the Bay of Naples as well, and in fact is, to all appearance, an eccentric millionaire. If he is a millionaire, he made his money on the *grande route*, not as a highwayman, but as a courier. Mr. Lever may have exaggerated. It may have been seldom that gentlemen who followed that somewhat harum-scarum calling took advantage of their opportunities to become capitalists, or included the art of saving among their other qualities. But there can be no question that those were the palmy times of the profession, and that they are gone never to return. Before the days of railways, Bradshaws, and Cooks, most of the people who went abroad on tours were really venturing into strange countries. They knew little or nothing of the speech of the natives; there were no interpreters to be found at the different posting-houses, no offices of information in the hotels, no cosmopolitan bankers who made it their business to be cross-examined, no waiters and porters professing polyglot accomplishments. There was no taking a ticket off-hand which franked you without further trouble over a couple of hundred leagues. When you posted, you pulled up every few miles to change horses and squabble with posting-masters and postillions. Frontiers were far more frequent than they are now that wars and revolutions have been obliterating the old landmarks everywhere. Passports were demanded perpetually, and they involved you in all manner of painful formalities. You were always being separated from your papers, and it was no easy matter recovering them, if you were left to your unaided exertions. You were constantly in the hands of gangs of custom-house officers, who insisted on your carriage being turned inside out, even to the contents of the sword-case, unless you were prepared to come down generously with black mail. In short, unless you had engaged some one on whom you could devolve your troubles, anxieties, and responsibilities, your tour from first to last would be a worry as well as a weariness. The chances were that you were well to do, and that money was of less consequence than loss of time and temper. So you hired your courier and gave him pretty much *carte blanche*; if you did not give it him, he was very certain to take it.

Those, we say, were the palmy days of the courier. He was hail-fellow-well-met with every landlord from Dover to the Dardanelles. He took his party to one house or the other—to Dessin or to Quillac, to the "Écu d'Or" or the "Cerv Volant"—as he found the hosts consulted his comforts and considered his commissions. No doubt the recompense for his recommendations was arranged for in the bill. His little private dinner was commended to the best care of the *chef*; and wines of the more esteemed vintages were produced for his delectation from the innermost recesses of the cellars. What may have passed between him and the landlord, when it came to be a question of settling the bill, was a mystery; they always withdrew together to the little family sitting-room behind the bar and beyond the vulgar gaze. But, whatever it might be to his master, that certainly was no very evil quarter of an hour for the courier, judging by the jolly smiling face with which he reappeared to swing himself up on the *impériale* of the travelling carriage, whence he waved the heartiest of farewells to the host in exchange for the kiss of the hand. To be sure he had always swallowed a flowing cup by way of parting ceremony, and the ample gourd that was slung to his portly person had been replenished with Bordeaux or Burgundy of body and

bouquet. But it is not uncharitable to suppose that his commissions were handsome, and that his pay, good as it was, was the smaller part of his profits. Then railways came in, and couriers began rather to go out. There had been a tyranny which had not always been tempered with due discretion. Not unfrequently they had forgotten to combine the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. They had been in the way of ostentatiously parading themselves as protectors and guardians to the injury of the self-respect of their charges. It was difficult to avoid regarding them somewhat in the light of spies. So with the introduction of railways the people who had been used to trust to their leading strings began to try to totter along without them. Like babies, when they get to "feeling their legs," tourists soon came to run alone. Having once begun to help themselves, foreign innkeepers began to find it to their profit to help them. No doubt the smiling host had often cursed in his heart his friend the courier whose hands he squeezed and whose cheeks he kissed with effusion. He sorely grudged to the friend of his soul the commission which reduced his personal gains so materially. If he could drop the middleman out of the bargain, he could at once undersell his competitors, and get more out of his customers. So he sent his son to study English. He insisted on his waiters passing competitive examinations in languages, and although it must be confessed that the standard of their attainments was far from a high one, yet they did pick up enough of foreign words to be wonderfully comforting to strange visitors. And what with the spread of the English speech, and the establishment of steam communications which shot you rapidly from city to city, and assured you a speedy retreat should your situation abroad become trying, couriers began to be dispensed with. Newly-married couples, who used to be among the best patrons of the class, were too glad to escape from under those Argus eyes which used to be fixed unwinkingly on their endearments, and made them matter of merry jest with the maid. Young men going on the great tour, the most lavish employers of all, felt an ingenuous shame in being dry-nursed over the Continent. The presence of a body servant who spoke and thought for them smacked too much of tutors and governors, and of those days of boyhood which they desired to forget. So what with one thing, what with another, couriers went much out of fashion, except with City millionaires who sought to swell their dignity by magnifying their retinue, and with ladies and invalids who had much better reason for placing themselves under the care of Greathearts in their pilgrimage.

There seems every reason to believe, however, that the opening of the Vienna Exhibition will give at least a temporary impetus to the prosperity of the couriers' guild. There has already been a rush of visitors to the Imperial city, and by-and-by there will no doubt be greater crowds and tremendous scramble and bustle both in the city and on the roads that lead to it. It will not be a simple question of being shown to snug rooms by obsequious waiters at any house which you may honour by your patronage. It is possible that, as the season goes on, decent quarters anywhere will become matter of negotiation and bargain, and although the sinister rumours of excessive charges may turn out to be somewhat exaggerated, yet simple prudence may often counsel one to come to some understanding in advance. It is in circumstances like these that the courier becomes a real luxury, nor is he likely to be a very expensive one. He will cost a good deal no doubt; but, on the other hand, he may save a great deal even in money, to say nothing of temper and trouble. His experience and topographical knowledge will often be invaluable. He will relieve you of the higgling which an English gentleman hates above all things, whatever may be the sentiments of some managing English ladies. Then in Vienna, unless the head of the family party means to make himself the slave of his household, he must provide himself with a domestic familiar of some kind, while there are many worthy people whom the sense of loneliness and isolation on the banks of the distant Danube might render fretfully nervous or moodily despondent. It would make all the difference between enjoyment and misery to have some one in charge who knows everything you are ignorant of, who thinks for you, tends you, feeds you, and to whose coat-tails you can cling in case of necessity. To many veteran travellers in Rhineland and Switzerland there will be a terrible sense of the adventurous when they are being carried so far beyond the range of their ordinary experiences. The heroes of the *Niebelung-sagen* never crossed the Danube stream with heavier anxiety as to all that might possibly be awaiting them. Tourists are no longer upon the homely Rhine, flowing through its familiar vineyards, and bearing its friendly rafts past hotels swarming with cockneys towards peaceful Holland and their English home. The Danube rushes towards the vague unknown, through wide plains peopled by semi-nomadic Magyars; through forests traversed by the half-armed Servian swineherds; past towns in the Principalities where baiting Jews and wrecking their dwellings is still the favourite pastime of the people; past tumble-down citadels that fly the Crescent, and white villages with crumbling minarets which are possibly being devastated by the mysterious plague. It is to be expected, too, that all these semi-barbarous States and provinces will send their representatives in troops to the great Exhibition. As you tread the unpaved streets of the innermost city, or make your way through the Leopoldstadt towards the Prater, you will be swaggered up against by haggard, wild-eyed Orientals, who are walking arsenals of deadly weapons. The Imperial police will give but moderate assurance to strangers to whom German is as one of the dead languages; although it may be some satisfaction to believe

that Scotland Yard has sent delegates from its detective force, and that a half-dozen or so of native-bred British officers are watching over the safety of their countrymen. When a sense of the strange is brooding oppressively upon you, there may be unspeakable comfort in the thought that trusty Fritz or Karl is always gliding at your elbow like a substantial shadow.

Jesting apart, if we are to judge from the reports of the Viennese journals, a corporation of couriers has made excellent arrangements for securing efficient service and protection to intending visitors. They seem to have established a central syndicate, which doubtless has its agencies in this country, and its recommendation should be a material guarantee for character and capacity. It is needless to point out how much of the enjoyment of the journey depends on your making a satisfactory choice. Except in its essentially temporary nature, the connexion with your courier more nearly resembles matrimony than any other that we can think of. There should be compatibility of temper and habits; that is to say, a good courier, like a good wife, should pretend to give in graciously on all occasions, should manage you so judiciously that you are never conscious of the pressure which directs your path. There should be absolute mutual confidence; that is to say, you should never have a suspicion that you are being deceived, and you should remain in blissful ignorance of any injuries that may be done you. If it should unfortunately prove otherwise, you are fretted past endurance by the very closeness of the ties that bind you and your travelling companion together; you see your enemy by your bed and your board, he thrusts his finger into all your arrangements, he makes his voice heard in all your money matters, and indeed he may be said to have mastered the strings of your purse. Separation is in your power, no doubt; but you cannot separate without sacrifices, recrimination, and a good deal of scandal. Then, bad as he was, and much as you have come to dislike him, you are sure to find that you miss him and his services if he leaves you, and if you try to form another connexion in haste, the chances are that you do worse than before. The moral of which is, that persons who propose to travel with couriers had better make their arrangements in time, and apply in the quarters that offer them substantial guarantees.

ASYLUM MANAGEMENT.

IT may be taken for granted that before very long there will be a change of some kind or other in the local administration of our counties. The English Justice of the Peace is confessedly an anomalous being. He is a Government official in so far as he has his commission from the Crown, but the fact of his being unpaid of itself makes him something wholly different from the paid servants of the Crown at home or abroad. On the other hand, the fact that he has his commission from the Crown makes him something wholly different from those officers, at home or abroad, whose authority springs from popular election. He cannot stand according to either the French principle or the Swiss principle. Even in England he stands by himself. Other officers of the Crown are paid; other unpaid officers are elective. All that is to be said for him is that he is, and that it is by no means clear that anybody else would do his work better or so well. And that this can be said for him is, in our land of precedent, a good deal. An anomalous institution is in England not likely to be upset simply because it is anomalous. Still, if an institution which is confessedly anomalous is attacked on other grounds by any powerful class, the fact that it is anomalous greatly strengthens the hands of those who attack it. The county magistracy, anomalous as it is in theory, might safely go on discharging its duties both judicial and administrative, if nobody found anything to say against it except that it is anomalous. But in several counties the ratepayers profess to have found out that the magistrates are not only anomalous but something much worse, namely extravagant. The charge in most cases arises from sheer misconception; but the practically important thing is that the charge has been brought. In the case of men who vote away the money of other men to whom they are in no way responsible, a suspicion, even an unjust suspicion, is almost as bad as a conviction. Men cannot in reason be asked to submit to taxation without representation any longer than they choose to submit to it. It is probable then that the present form of county administration will have, at some not very distant day, to give way to the elective board in some shape or other. It is hardly a question whether the change will be for the better or for the worse. When those who are affected by an anomalous institution say that it is not only an anomaly but a practical grievance, the anomaly cannot stand.

We have before now had to speak our mind about the local government of counties, and we shall no doubt have to do so again more than once before the matter is finally settled. Some settlement must be made some time, but the chances of a really good settlement will be seriously endangered if the subject of local government be taken up as an electioneering question for political parties to outbid one another about. The vote of the farmers is already so powerful, the Ballot is likely to make it so much more powerful, that there is the greatest possible temptation for all parties to bid for their support. It is certainly not an agreeable aspect of human nature to hear magistrates, especially Conservative magistrates, disparaging their own order and flattering the prejudices of the farmers, with a view to an expected election. The advanced Liberal is sometimes less zealous for change

on this head than his Conservative neighbour. He has been known to argue that democracy is the right thing where it is to be had, but that, where democracy is not to be had, there is nothing gained by pulling down a better oligarchy to set up a worse. It is quite certain that, as regards the efficiency of public administration, above all as regards the welfare of the classes below both, it would be no improvement to exchange a government of squires for a government of farmers. Some malicious tongues have gone so far as to say that the farmer is produced by keeping the bad side of the squire and leaving out the good. However this may be, it is certain that the tendency of the farmer is to take a breeches-pocket view of everything, to grudge every penny that is spent, to delight in the false economy which makes some petty saving at the cost of really efficient and liberal administration. It is said that some Poor-law Guardians believe that their title means that their duty is, not to be Guardians of the poor, but to be Guardians of the parish purse against the poor. It is certain that it is the hardest thing in the world to make a body of farmers understand that an incompetent officer is far dearer at a low salary than a competent officer is at a high salary.

There is one branch of local administration above all which it will never do to hand over to bodies at all like the present Boards of Guardians. These are the Pauper Lunatic Asylums. Of the two it would be far better to centralize them, to place them, at the risk of any number of outcries, under purely Government management of some kind. We are far from wishing for any such change. All that we can say is that, of two possible changes, this would be the lesser evil. The management of the Asylums at present is somewhat peculiar. A Committee of Visiting Magistrates is appointed yearly by Quarter Sessions; but, when once appointed, they are, for most purposes, independent of the Court. They have on great occasions to come to the Court for money; but in ordinary life they have more to do with the Commissioners in Lunacy. That is, when they have to lay out money beyond the income of the Asylum itself, they have to come to Quarter Sessions for it, while they have not to come, like other Committees, for the confirmation of their ordinary acts. The local public at large therefore hears of them only as spenders of money and has very little notion of what the real work of the Asylum is. In more counties than one an outcry is raised against the extravagance of the Asylum Visitors, which for the most part simply proves the ignorance of those who raise it. We allow that the ignorance itself is often not their fault, but to raise a disturbance about matters of which they are even innocently ignorant is certainly a grave fault. That the general public should know little of the details of Asylum management is a necessary consequence of the form of management which the law has decreed for Asylums. Therefore Boards of Guardians and the like would be better employed in attending to their own duties than in censuring men who are doing their own duties also, though in a sphere which is necessarily less open to the public eye. But it is much worse when a future candidate or his zealous supporters join in the outcry with a view to the next election, or when a nobleman bent on a popular harangue thinks that his nobility exempts him from any need to get up the subject on which he is speaking. The cry of extravagance is of all cries the easiest to raise, unless possibly the cry of Popery. And people raise it as if magistrates, and especially Visitors of Asylums, had some interest in extravagance. From the way in which malcontent Guardians and the like are apt to talk, one would think that the rates went into the magistrates' pockets, instead of the magistrates having to pay them like other people. In matters of expense the interest of the magistrates is exactly the same as the interest of the ratepayers, for the simple reason that the magistrates are themselves ratepayers. Any one who knows anything of the working of Quarter Sessions must know that hardly a penny can be spent without some zealous economist rising to object to spending it. Extravagance is certainly not the fault of a body of men who, if they vote away other people's money, vote away their own also. But it is possible that expenses which seem necessary to those who understand the matter in hand may sometimes seem extravagant to those who know nothing about it.

One point at which the class represented by the elected Guardians are apt to grumble is the salary paid to the Medical Superintendents of the Asylums. A retiring Superintendent gets a pension, or the actual Superintendent gets an increase of salary, and the voices of the discontented are loud against the waste of the public money. It is in vain to tell them what a post that of the Superintendent of an Asylum really is, to tell them of the rare union of intellectual and moral qualities which it calls for, the scientific skill, the tact, the temper, the thorough zeal for his work without which the work cannot be done—qualities which are cheaply purchased indeed at 500*l.* or 600*l.* a year. It is in vain to tell them of the wearing and distressing nature of his duties, of the special need that his work should have occasional breaks, and that it should not—for fear of his own mind giving way—be kept on for any very great number of years together. It is in vain to point out that for this very purpose an Act of Parliament was passed allowing pensions to be granted to officers of Asylums after a shorter term of service than formerly; to show perhaps that the pension complained of might, by the terms of the Act, have been much higher in amount and might have been granted several years sooner. It is in vain to tell them how cheaply the services of a really good Superintendent are bought at the highest salary which any

Superintendent receives—to explain the constant, discriminating, and delicate treatment which is needed by patients under the various forms of disease; how many little refinements which to the vulgar eye might seem luxuries are really parts of the medical treatment; how the pictures, the band, the theatre, the chapel with its fabric and services at least up to the standard of a well-ordered village church, all have their direct share in doing the work which the Asylum has to do; how great a power of organization as well as of scientific skill is needed in the man who has to look to all these things and to manage a large staff of inferior officers. All this goes for nothing with men whose one cry is that the thing might be done cheaper. So it doubtless might, if all that is needed were, after the good old fashion, to chain and beat our lunatics, to shut them up in cold and darkness and nakedness. The Guardians could doubtless get that done for a much smaller sum. Or they might doubtless even get the parish doctor, for a much smaller increase of his pay, to look in at the Asylum every day as he looks in at the workhouse. Or something might be saved by cutting down Asylum diet to the standard of workhouse diet, the difference between which two standards is shown by the simplest of tests; patients removed from the Asylum to the workhouse always lose in weight, while patients removed from the workhouse to the Asylum always gain. And there is one way perhaps better than any of these for lessening Asylum charges, and for taking away the need for enlarged Asylum buildings—a way which many a grumbling Guardian has in his own hands. No one cause sends so many patients to the Asylum as drunkenness; every Guardian who pays any part of his labourers' wages in drink instead of in money is directly helping to increase the number of Asylum patients, and thereby to increase the amount of Asylum charges and the size of Asylum buildings.

The upshot of all this is that, whatever changes may be coming in the form of the local government of our counties, the Lunatic Asylums at all events must not be handed over to bodies whose spirit and temper are at all like that of our present Boards of Guardians. They cannot be managed under the influence of that hard grudging spirit which forces every penny, either for the proper welfare of the inmates of the workhouse or for the fair pay of its officers, to be absolutely wrung out of it. The way in which the Guardians manage the workhouses, the way in which their complaints show that they wish to manage the Asylums, is proof enough that they must never be allowed to have them in their hands. Under their care the proper medical treatment could never be carried out. No medical man of the class which alone is fit for the delicate work of Superintendent of an Asylum would either take such pay as they would offer him, or would submit to such interference as theirs. Whatever happens, our Lunatic Asylums must not be placed in the hands of men less liberal of money, less able to understand the position and feelings of an able scientific man, than they are now. Local management is no doubt best when fit local management can be had, but if the only form of local management that is to be had is such local management as is likely to be given us by Boards of Guardians or bodies at all like them, the care of our Asylums had better become a direct branch of the business of the central Government.

THE GROCERS AGAIN.

WE gather from some communications which have been published in the *Grocer* that the retail members of that trade are just at present by no means in a happy frame of mind. Even the reduction of the sugar duty does not cheer their drooping spirits. It would seem that they have come to the conclusion that all the world is in a conspiracy against them. The public is very hard upon them on one side, and the wholesale houses are very hard upon them on the other, and then there is the new Adulteration Act to fill up their cup. The Adulteration Act is the newest grievance, and for the moment it produces the loudest outcry. The grocers think it very cruel that they should be required, under criminal penalties, to vouch for the purity of the articles which they offer for sale. They assert, of course, that no adulteration ever takes place after the goods arrive at their shops, but then it is impossible for them to be sure that adulteration has not been previously practised. They do not manufacture or import the goods themselves; they purchase them from the wholesale houses, and they have to trust to those houses to give them an honest return for their money. To the mind of the retail grocer nothing can be simpler or more obvious than that the wholesale dealers should alone be held responsible for the purity of the wares sold in shops. It is conceivable, however, that the wholesale dealers might have something to say in opposition to this proposal. They would naturally object to be made responsible for the character of goods which had passed beyond their control. In many cases they are only importers, not manufacturers; and they, too, are liable to have bad goods passed off upon them when they go into the market. If the retail people had their way, the wholesale houses might find themselves called upon to answer, not only for the quality of the goods as they sold them, but for the quality of the goods after they had gone into the hands of other persons. An impartial public will be disposed to believe that adulteration is practised sometimes by the wholesale dealers, sometimes by the shopkeepers, and sometimes by both in succession. The only way in which adulteration can be effectually checked is to come down on the person in whose possession the adulterated goods happen to be found. It is

true that he may be the innocent victim of an imposition, but he will have an opportunity of proving this, if he can, before he is convicted.

If the shopkeepers will only exert themselves to expose the frauds of wholesale dealers, and to bring the offenders to justice, the public will be very grateful to them; but we are afraid the public can hardly afford to relieve the shopkeepers from all responsibility in the matter. It is not too much to expect that a man who sets up as a grocer should have some knowledge of the articles he undertakes to supply, and should be able to discriminate between genuine and spurious commodities. If he cannot trust his own judgment in every case, a small fee to an analytical chemist will enable him to submit the doubtful goods to an authoritative test. It is much easier for a shopkeeper to test his goods in bulk than for every customer to test them in small quantities; and the practical advantage of the law as it stands is that it puts a certain amount of pressure on the shopkeeper to take precautions on this point which he would be very apt to neglect if he were allowed to transfer all his responsibility as a matter of course to the wholesale houses. Whether goods in the Custom House and in bonded warehouses should not be subjected to a regular system of inspection is a question which certainly deserves consideration. The retailers are of course entitled to the benefit of every protection against the trickery of wholesale dealers which can be reasonably extended to them, both for their own sake and for the sake of the public; and adulteration, notwithstanding Mr. Bright's famous dictum, is really such an abominable kind of robbery that no effort should be spared to track it down and punish it. The Reports which were laid on Tuesday before the City Commission of Sewers contain some rather startling disclosures on this subject. Dr. Letheby, the Medical Officer of Health for the City, lately heard that a thousand boxes of adulterated green tea were being offered for public sale, but the tea was all sold before he could interfere. Samples, however, had been taken and the names of the purchasers obtained. He found that the samples contained from forty to forty-three per cent. of iron filings and nineteen per cent. of silica in the form of fine sand, which had been mixed with the leaves before curling evidently with a view to increase their weight and bulk. After the leaves were curled they were covered with green pigment, and when infused in boiling water they produced "a very turbid solution, offensive to the smell and nauseous to the taste." In another instance Dr. Letheby was privately warned that a large quantity of unsound tea was being hawked about in the City, and on inquiry he found that it was salvage from a wreck. The tea, after having been well soaked in salt water, was dried and otherwise manipulated in order to give it a decent appearance, and was then packed in old tea-chests and stored in a bonded warehouse. All the samples were composed of "exhausted and putrid leaves, and were utterly unfit for human consumption." In a joint Report the Medical Officer and the Solicitor of the Commission have pointed out the difficulties of dealing with articles unfit for food in bonded warehouses, owing to the want of definite, speedy, and certain information of the existence of such articles, and of power to enter the warehouses for the purposes of examination and analysis. They suggest that the Medical Officer of Health or Nuisance Inspector should be enabled to inspect goods in bonded warehouses, and, in the event of their being found to be unsound or impure, to obtain an order from the justices for their seizure and condemnation, or at least for their being held in custody until fully examined.

A meeting was held in London last week at which a number of grocers exchanged views as to the present state of the trade. We cannot say that the speeches which were delivered convey the impression that the grocers have as yet arrived at a very correct appreciation of the conditions under which they have to do business, or of the proper course for them to pursue. But on one point at least they have come to a sound conclusion, and that is as to the advantage of co-operation among themselves. The shopkeepers seem to be becoming resigned to the existence of Co-operative Stores as an inevitable evil, and the only question now is how to compete with them to the best advantage. "A hair of the dog that bit you" is an old prescription to which the grocers appear to have turned in their despair. They have resolved to meet co-operation by co-operation, but it is still uncertain what form their co-operation is to assume. In the first instance, the retailers endeavoured to frighten the wholesale houses into refusing to do business with the Co-operative Stores, and in some instances they succeeded. The only result, however, was that, when one firm threw up a contract under pressure of this kind, there were others eager to obtain it, and the Stores have never found the slightest difficulty in procuring whatever goods they required at wholesale prices. The Stores give large orders and pay cash down, and these are temptations which few traders are able to resist. The retail people are at last convinced of the hopelessness of attempting to prevent the Stores from obtaining wholesale supplies, and have determined to apply whatever pressure they can bring to bear on the wholesale dealers in order to obtain better bargains for themselves. An Association has been projected for the purpose of supplying grocers, oilmen, shipowners, &c., with goods at a small percentage on cost, "to enable them to meet the competition of Co-operative Societies." There is no reason to doubt that an establishment of this kind, if judiciously managed, might prove highly beneficial to the grocers. By uniting in this way, they would enjoy the advantage of making wholesale purchases on a large scale, and of putting into

their own pockets a share at least of the profits which at present go to enrich the wholesale dealers. Indeed, even without forming a large association, grocers might, by combining together in small groups, often effect advantageous purchases. They would do well to remember, however, that the success of the Co-operative Stores is entirely due to their strict adherence to cash transactions both in buying and selling; and it is hopeless for the grocers to attempt to compete with them on equal terms unless they are prepared to act on similar principles. We observe in the prospectus of the proposed Grocers' Supply Association that it is intended to allow members to obtain goods on credit to the amount of 100*l.* worth a year for each share held; and here we have at the outset a departure from the ready money system. It must never be forgotten that in one way or another credit must be paid for, and shopkeepers who trade on borrowed capital are necessarily weighted in the race as compared with those who pay for everything in cash. One of the speakers at the meeting at which this project of co-operation was discussed urged that wholesale houses should be "utterly done away with," forgetting apparently that the new association would be only a wholesale house managed by a company. Another grocer, in the course of what is described as "a vigorous speech," thought that his fellow-traders suffered from being "too nervous." His advice was to "put $\frac{1}{4}$ *l.* a pound on moist and $\frac{1}{4}$ *l.* on lump sugar, and don't be nervous." Some indignation was expressed at the candid admission of the chairman and other speakers that the retail dealers were suffering from the competition of the Stores. One gentleman said he thought it was "showing a flag of weakness before the public to come before them with such associations as this." It was only because the public was so ignorant that it was taken in by the Stores. This gentleman, however, was reminded that mere talking about the Stores would not talk them down. The success of a Grocers' Supply Association would of course depend on the amount of practical experience and sagacity with which it was conducted; but there seems to be no reason why a committee of grocers could not manage such a business as well as a committee of Civil Service clerks. Even if the grocers combined for nothing else, they would do well to combine with a view to protect themselves from having unsound or adulterated goods passed off upon them by wholesale dealers. An organized system of inspection and analysis, with a fund for prosecuting fraudulent merchants, would be as much to their own advantage as to that of the public.

We find in the same number of the paper which reports the meeting of the grocers a report of the annual meeting of the Civil Service Supply Association (Limited). The balance-sheet shows that goods were sold last year to the amount of 391,792*l.*, at a gross profit of 32,000*l.*, which was reduced, however, by working expenses to a net sum of 5,300*l.* The principle is to sell at cost price articles which do not deteriorate by keeping, and which are packed for sale, such as pickles, preserved meats, &c. In other cases a small percentage is added to cover risks and expenses. It is interesting to know that the Association expects to be able to sell sugar at a reduction of a farthing a pound if Mr. Lowe's Budget is carried; so that the gentleman at the grocers' meeting who urged the retailers not to be "nervous" about raising the price of sugar may perhaps find that the competition of the Stores cannot be ignored. If the shopkeepers experience a pang of envy and jealousy when they read the large figures of the Association's balance-sheet, they may perhaps derive some consolation from hearing that the managers of the society are not successful in pleasing everybody. Earnest appeals have been addressed to the Association on the subject of port wine, and they laid down a considerable stock of port in anticipation of the demand from members. The consequence is that they have still a large stock on hand. "If gentlemen," said the Chairman, "will not drink old port wine we cannot keep up the supply," and there certainly does not appear to be any means of compelling gentlemen to drink old port wine if they don't like it. It appears that Mr. O'Dowd also "alluded to the subject of Irish whisky," but his remarks, in consequence of the noise prevailing in the room, were unfortunately lost to the reporters. It would appear that there is a great Irish whisky question as well as an old port question, and another gentleman was very bitter about the "great coal question." A member thought the Stores were extravagant with paper and string, and another demanded a series of detailed accounts showing the precise profit and loss on every article sold in the establishment. The Chairman pointed out that it was by simplifying their accounts as much as possible that the Stores were enabled to do business cheaply, and that the information asked for would add considerably to the annual expenses. On the whole, the Committee seem to have quite enough of questions of one kind and another on their hands, and their moderate allowance of 1,500 guineas to be divided amongst them can hardly be said to have been too easily earned. If a resolution which was carried at this meeting is confirmed by a ballot, the Association will pass into a new phase of existence. Hitherto it has been open to any member of the Civil Service to become a shareholder, but it is proposed that the issue of shares should be stopped, and, if this is agreed upon, the Association will become, in a great measure, an ordinary proprietary business. The profits will belong to the existing body of shareholders, and there are already indications that a conflict of interests may some day arise between shareholders who are anxious for large dividends and members of the Association who are interested in obtaining cheap goods.

RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS IN GERMANY.

THE ecclesiastical contest in Germany has by no means lain dormant, though it seems of late to have attracted less public attention. Both in the political and in the strictly religious sphere events are rapidly advancing, and it remains to be seen whether the two parallel streams which have hitherto run each its own separate course will converge to a common issue. One question on which great stress was laid at the Cologne Congress of last September has, we observe, already come before the German Reichstag, and has been referred to a Select Committee for consideration; that is, the introduction of compulsory civil marriage throughout the Empire. Meanwhile the ecclesiastical Bills of the Government have been passed without any substantial change by an overwhelming majority of the Upper House of the Prussian Landtag. A formal protest has been made by the Archbishop of Cologne, and we presume some similar measure is in contemplation by the episcopate generally, as they have again met at Fulda to seek inspiration at the tomb of St. Boniface. But they sat with closed doors, and as yet no intimation has been given of the result of their deliberations. It does not, however, at all follow that their condemnation of Prince Bismarck's Church policy would represent or evoke the universal feeling of the Catholics, or even of the Catholic clergy of Prussia. And it is certainly a curious fact, if it is correctly reported, that, of some fifty petitions against Dr. Falk's Bills presented to the Herrenhaus, forty-one should have emanated from Protestant congregations. The laity may not unreasonably be disposed to think that a university education is an innocuous, if not positively beneficial, preliminary to the more professional curriculum of candidates for the priesthood. And the clergy themselves, whatever opinion they may hold about methods of clerical training, can hardly be expected to cling with peculiar affection to the arbitrary exercise of episcopal authority, which it is the object of one of these new measures to restrain. It is not improbable, from what is known of their characters and antecedents, that there may even be those among the bishops whose personal convictions are favourable to some part at least of the new legislation, as we know there are those among them who expressed their personal satisfaction at the expulsion of the Jesuits, though they had joined in a corporate protest against it beforehand. The question of the abstract merits or demerits of the new laws is of course quite distinct from the wider inquiry as to the policy or justice of imposing regulations materially affecting the internal organization of the Church, by the exclusive action of the civil power. Into that discussion we need not enter here, further than to observe—that is obvious—that a certain margin must necessarily be allowed for differences of national sentiment and usage, and that it has always been customary for foreign, especially Prussian, Governments to interfere, and to interfere with a high hand, in many matters where any such interposition would be thought intolerable in England. At present, however, we are chiefly concerned with the facts. What is certain is that the four Bills have passed the Herrenhaus, and although a final reference to the Lower House is requisite as a matter of form, it is expected that they will have received the Royal assent and have become part of the law of Prussia by the end of next week. The further step of extending their obligation to the whole German Empire can hardly be long delayed, and already Bavaria and some of the other smaller States are preparing to adopt it on their own account without waiting for the action of the Imperial Diet.

The expulsion of the Jesuits, though it raised less violent opposition in Ultramontane circles than the directly ecclesiastical measures since introduced, is, as we have before pointed out, still more difficult to defend on grounds either of justice or expediency. And the Report just presented by the Committee appointed by the Diet to ascertain the exact sense of the clause which includes all societies "related to the Jesuits," without naming them, in the sentence of banishment, extends the scope of the measure far beyond what had appeared to be its original limits. Not only are certain small congregations regularly affiliated to the Jesuits put under ban, but all communities which share what the Committee have defined to constitute the leading characteristics of the Jesuit Order are also to share their fate. These characteristics are stated to be three—namely, the aiming at a universal spiritual despotism, the internal centralization of discipline organized with this object, and universal extension to all parts of the world. The two former peculiarities may fairly be allowed to distinguish the Jesuits, both in fact and in the intention of the master mind which planned the system, from the older religious corporations in the Church. But if they have been more successful in extending their operations over the world than their older rivals in the field, this is mainly due to their superior organization and unity of aim. The Dominicans and Franciscans are not less cosmopolite in idea than the Jesuits, and for three centuries before the Reformation the Franciscans were the great missionary power of the Latin Church, just as the Jesuits have been for the three centuries since. However, the Committee have reported that by the application of these tests the Redemptorist and Lazarist Fathers must be held to be included in the scope of the law, and they will accordingly, we presume, be banished from German soil. This rough and ready method of expelling Ultramontane influences "by a fork" can hardly fail to suggest to a looker-on the probability that, like similar methods of expelling nature, it may lead to a reaction. Downright persecution of this sort (we are speaking now simply of the Jesuit law), unless it is very thorough indeed—more

thorough than is well possible in this nineteenth century—usually defeats itself.

It would be an interesting inquiry, if there were any sufficient data to rely upon, what effect recent changes will have, at the present very critical epoch in the history of the Roman Catholic Church, on the future of German Catholicism, and how they will be received by the two great sections into which it is at present divided. There is little in Prince Bismarck's policy which the Old Catholics would not hail with satisfaction; most of it, including the proposed establishment of civil marriage, is virtually the carrying out of their own professed programme. But will the Ultramontane majority passively, however sullenly, acquiesce, or are we to look for a kind of religious civil war, if such a phrase may be allowed? We have seen already that a large number of Protestant petitions against the new laws was presented, and it has been asserted that the majority of the "Old Lutherans," or what may be called in English phraseology the High Church section of the Evangelical Church, will side with Catholics in their resistance. It may be so, though we do not feel by any means sure of it. Neither indeed can it safely be assumed that the Catholic opposition will take any very determined shape, notwithstanding the fiery language addressed by the Ultramontane *Germania*, in a kind of editorial allocution, to the assembled bishops at Fulda. The modern State is first identified with Satan saying to the unchangeable Church, "All this I will give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me," and is soon afterwards, in a peroration more sonorous than strictly intelligible, somehow metamorphosed into a combined embodiment of Judaism and heathenism, whose oppressive gloom is at last to be triumphantly dispelled by "the eternal sunlight of Christianity." But the Ultramontane journals, both in Germany and elsewhere, are much addicted to what the Americans call "tall talk," and there is another passage in this same article which may suggest a different conclusion from that intended by the writer. He observes, with perfect justice, that "immense sacrifices will be demanded" of those who are resolved to resist the action of the State, and then adds—what is by no means equally clear—"as is always the case, these sacrifices will be made." But that depends entirely on the earnestness and strength of conviction of the Ultramontane party, and some of those who are best acquainted with the internal condition of religious parties in Germany do not at all believe that Ultramontane earnestness will stand the crucial test of sacrifice. There, as elsewhere, the infallibilist ranks are demoralized by a secret indifference, if not scepticism, which is entirely consistent with very loud talking while talking only is required, and is even likely to promote it, but is not at all likely to inspire vigorous action or patient endurance of serious trial and discomfort. Meanwhile, however, the State does not appear to be particularly firm in its support of the Old Catholics. The other day the parishioners of Hirschberg, in Silesia, elected an ex-communicated Old Catholic priest, Dr. Hassler, as their pastor, to whom the Bishop of Breslau of course refused institution; and on an appeal to the Government the Bishop was supported in his refusal, and a second election was ordered to be made. In Switzerland, however, the movement seems to be carrying all before it, and even the eccentricities of Father Hyacinthe, who was invited by an indiscreet minority to Geneva, have not seriously retarded the growth of a large and increasing party of *bona fide* Catholics who openly repudiate infallibilism.

In Germany there has been an important Old Catholic meeting held at Bonn, under the presidency of Dr. Schulte, who has migrated from Prague to the banks of the Rhine, and now holds a professorship in the northern University. It was decided that the annual Congress should be held next September at Constance, where two Old Catholic congregations have been established, but the main object of the meeting was to elect a bishop. And about this some hitch seems to have occurred. Dr. Döllinger was understood to be opposed to the step, as unnecessary, or at least premature, and two of the most distinguished leaders of the movement, Reinkens and Reusch, whose names have been in everybody's mouth during the last twelvemonth as the future nominees, have declined the office. In Reinkens's case a sincere diffidence as to his own qualifications was unquestionably the controlling motive, but Reusch is said to have also expressed doubts of the wisdom of making any appointment at present. The scheme, however, has not been abandoned, and the 4th of June is now fixed for the election of a bishop, whose salary was announced to have already been secured. And when the bishop is elected and consecrated (by the Archbishop of Utrecht) a synod is to be held, and a plan of synodical action, drawn up by a Committee of the Cologne Congress, will be submitted to it. There are obvious reasons to account for even the warmest supporters of the cause shrinking from what must inevitably be a difficult and trying, and may not improbably prove a somewhat thankless office. But, on the other hand, it is not easy to see how the movement is to hold its ground at all, for any time, even allowing it to be a strictly provisional arrangement, as Dr. Döllinger insists, without any bishops; and it is plain that if bishops there are to be, whether one or more, its future success will very materially depend on the wisdom displayed in their selection. Both Reinkens and Reusch are men of great learning and sober judgment, besides being earnest and eloquent speakers; but an episcopal firebrand might easily do more mischief to the cause of which he had become the official representative than all its episcopal opponents put together, and even a respectable non-entity might very seriously discredit it. The Old Catholics may

perhaps be disposed to regret that Schulte himself, whose tact and power have been shown to be fully equal to his evident intensity of conviction, happens to be a layman and a married man. It is not, however, our business to speculate on the chances of the approaching election, but we shall look with considerable interest to the report of the meeting to be held at Cologne on the 4th of June. The little Church of Utrecht has hitherto presented the sole example of a Latin episcopate repudiating the modern encroachments of the Papacy, and the desperate attempts which have been made from time to time to suppress it by artifice or by force are a measure of the gravity of such a phenomenon in Roman eyes. But the Archbishops of Utrecht have studiously maintained an attitude of purely passive resistance, and the community they rule over is neither a large nor an increasing one. An Old Catholic bishop in Germany could not fail to be brought into direct and active antagonism with the upholders of the Vatican decrees.

THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

II.

THE French critic, M. Beulé, begins one of his thoughtful essays with these words:—"The return of the Exhibitions is looked to as a fête—a fête of intelligence and of taste, and yet, notwithstanding, art is lost." He then proceeds to examine the causes why exhibitions do not arrest, but, according to the opinion of some, actually accelerate, the decadence of art. In England we certainly have an interest in ascertaining how it came to pass that a period of decadence at once set in when the Royal Academy gained power and position by the possession of Burlington House. That the present Exhibition should show steady and continuous decline is all the more anomalous inasmuch as there are reasons why a revival might have been anticipated. One cause of the falling away within the last few years is but too common in the experience of all intellectual movements, whether in art, science, or literature. The transition is always critical and sometimes fatal between one generation and another; the chasm which lies between men who, amid crowning works, have been gathered to the last garner, and their unaccredited successors, it is often impossible to fill up. The Academy has suffered losses which it is difficult to make good; the death of such painters as Maclise, Phillip, Creswick, and Mason leaves blanks which must long be felt. And then, in addition to these losses, there comes in the course of nature a continuous falling away; men who once worked hard and well reach the time of life when they take things easily. And unfortunately it has so happened that at this juncture the younger and rising generation is scarcely strong enough to bear the heat and burden of the day. Hence for the moment the Exhibition is without leading spirits and governing powers; but that this period of interregnum will be of long duration there seems to be no serious ground for fear. Talent is cropping up even in obscure places, and good honest work is pressing forward; moreover there appears to be a sincere desire on the part of the Academy to afford to men of promise a chance of making themselves known. But, reverting to the dangers which M. Beulé sees in the present system of exhibitions, we may mention an evil which at this moment specially besets the Royal Academy. Instead of being sustained by the State, it is an institution actuated by individual motives, and private interests, it may be feared, prevail over the public good. Accordingly these exhibitions, in default of authoritative and intelligent control, are a compromise of parties, a kind of give and take, a foregone conclusion in favour of friends who are kindly allowed to get a good turn. All this is so much the way of the world in every profession that no one in particular can be blamed, and yet the result is a confusion little short of calamitous. The exhibition becomes a medley, mediocrity in the majority puts talent into an eccentric minority, the tares grow up and choke the wheat. Galleries thus arranged are often the reverse of educational; indeed they sometimes sanction with authority works which the public should be taught to despise. It seems one province of contemporary criticism to strike the just balance, to supply as it were a *catalogue raisonné*, and to point to the causes which may be tending to the advance or to the decline of our English art.

The largest picture of the year is dedicated by Mr. Poynter, A.R.A., to the "Dragon of Wantley" (541); the legend has been set forth at length in the *Percy Reliques*. The incidents in this particular legend do not materially differ from the usual routine of these stories; the dragon, as a matter of course, has committed outrages, and the people in consequence are supposed to have fled for succour to a gallant knight, who, having chosen with care his armour, has been dressed for the fight by a young damsel. The typical form of these romances is of the more importance inasmuch as Mr. Poynter is understood to be engaged on four bulky dragon pictures, of which this is only the second; the story of "Perseus and Andromeda" having last year furnished him with an introduction to the series. In the present instance the spectator may imagine himself near a Yorkshire village called Wantley, within a mile of the seat of the late Mr. Wortley Montagu. The spot chosen is a wooded and rocky headland which overlooks a wide sweep of hill and dale, a line of country common to Yorkshire. As we stand before the picture it would appear that the painter has been careful to reproduce the actual scene associated with the song, and assuredly no locality could be better suited to his purpose. Grandly conceived are the tree trunks which assume tragic con-

tortions as if in response to the dragon's writhings; and the dragon himself, described in the poem as of "furious wings," "long claws," and "jaws of four-and-forty teeth of iron," rises to the nobility which distinguishes the higher order of dragons from the meaner and more extravagant of the species. Mr. Poynter has greatly improved on his dragon of last year, which was a raving vulgar monster; now he comes more near to the Turneresque idea, which is the noblest conception of a dragon known to modern times. "More of More Hall," the "peerless knight of these woods," is seen with arm and sword raised ready to give the final thrust. The drama sustains its action well, the drawing is firm and true. Perhaps to the general public the style may still seem rather dry and hard; yet the grand treatment of the lines, and the solemnity of the colours, show that Mr. Poynter in his eclecticism has not excluded Titian from his studies.

Mr. E. M. Ward, R.A., has a powerful composition, "The Eve of St. Bartholomew" (207). Admiral Coligny, after the attempt to assassinate him before the massacre, is visited in bed by the King, Catherine de Medici, and the Duke of Anjou. The situation is striking, and the figures have a dignity befitting historic art; yet they would appear to more advantage if less heavy and dark; the colours, too, might be improved by the presence of quiet and retiring greys in the place of hot pigments. But the artist has evidently been ready to sacrifice much to manly strength. Mrs. E. M. Ward finds a congenial theme for her dexterous pencil in the "marvellous boy" Chatterton (361). Known dates indicate an age of only thirteen; in other words, this picture is four or five years prior to the closing scene in Mr. Wallis's well-known picture, "The Death of Chatterton." The Bristol Bluecoat schoolboy had, in fact, not as yet published a line, yet here in a little garret, with the tower of Redcliffe within sight of the window, we see, by the presence of parchments, papers, and pounce-bags, the resolve to forge a way to renown. The foster-mother of the poet schoolboy disturbs him at his work; he complains, "You are too curious and clear-sighted; I wish you would bide out of the room. It is my room." Evidently here was a capital subject for a picture; yet we incline to think more might have been made of it if a crouching or bent-up attitude had not been given to the hero, who thus appears diminutive and almost insignificant. The axiom of Du Fresnoy might, we think, have been remembered with advantage, that the hero of a composition should meet the eye fair in the front, in all the blaze of light. Yet the story is pleasantly told, and the picture capably painted, especially in its realistic details. Indeed the artist has been so careful of local circumstances that the work may be accepted almost as an historic record.

Some few religious pictures may be mentioned in addition to those which we ventured to condemn in our introductory notice. "Christ's Reproof of the Pharisees" (187) is not the best work we can recall by Mr. Armitage, R.A.; the manner, though simple enough, is dry and hard; the figures of Christ and the Apostles, though not without dignity, have no approach to the divine. Mr. Herbert, R.A., seems to fall into an opposite extreme when he throws spasmodic emotion into the figure of "St. Mary Magdalene at the Foot of the Cross" (302). Mr. Herbert has studiously qualified himself for these sacred themes, and if to eschew what may be termed "the fleshly school" of painting, and to give, in lieu of warm flesh, cold stone and hard wood, be the vitality of spiritual art, then must he rank as one of the foremost of religious painters. Mr. Herbert has certainly a right to boast that his impersonation of the Magdalen is the reverse of that of Titian; indeed he probably would prefer to find himself side by side with Ary Scheffer, who, when affecting spirituality, thought it but fitting to be colourless. Mr. Watts, R.A., we may be sure, paints on the converse theory, as may be easily seen in his figure of "The Prodigal" (281). Here, instead of pallor and poverty of pallet, is power of colour and impasto. But diversity in the treatment of Biblical subjects is not only allowable, but even imperative; the assumption has been too often tacitly made that a painter is bound to impart some undefined religious aspect to every character taken from the Old or the New Testament, whereas there are many personages—such, for example, as the Prodigal Son—who can have no claim to the privilege of religious treatment. In like manner, "After the Expulsion" (282) is not necessarily a theme for religious sentiment; accordingly Mr. Elmore has been content to depict Eve merely as a noble and beauteous form of humanity; the light of the countenance is shadowed by dark destiny as the mother of our race, fairer than all her daughters, wanders with an infant on her shoulder into the wide world shelterless. The accessory figures compose grandly and complete the story. The painter has been studious of his types, and if there be still the possibility of a high art among us, noble generic types wherefrom accident and blemish are eliminated must once more claim a first care. Mr. Dobson, R.A., has long laboured in the direction of ideal art, but in such works as "St. Paul at Philippi" (291) the misfortune is that, in seeking his type, he eliminates and refines away so much that in the end there is little or nothing of nature left. Here "a certain damsel" could scarcely have lost her wits, because it is but too obvious that she never had any. Painters, like other people, fall into the error of supposing that the road to religion lies across a prostrated intellect, whereas some of the finest brains ever seen in life or within the sphere of art are found in the sacred works of the Old Masters.

Mr. Alma Tadema apparently holds the opposite conviction that Biblical painting may be all the better for weight of intellect.

"The Death of the Firstborn" (1033) is terrific in intensity. The scene has been laid in one of those Egyptian temples familiar to all travellers when in ruin, but here restored with archaeological care, both architecturally and ritually. The death of the firstborn has filled the shadowy fane with wailing, hooded figures like spectres from tombs raise hand and voice, and musicians with strange instruments faintly seen by fitful lights swell the lament. In front of the spectator one of these firstborn in the prime of youth is stretched on the knees of a stately creature, who may be taken for the King. "And it came to pass that at midnight, the Lord smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the firstborn of the captive that was in the dungeon." The mother throws herself on the dead body of her son. This picture has its faults. Alma Tadema, of Northern descent, has no Venetian blood in his veins; his handling and his colour when compared with Italian methods are heavy and opaque; and, following this line of thought, a logical necessity might compel us to deny to him the faculty of imagination, which in the history of pictorial art has proved itself supreme only in Italy. And yet this Dutch painter—a pupil of Baron Leys, and now a naturalized British subject—produces from time to time works which give to imagination a more extended sphere. Indeed a new problem is here presented to us; we seem to have arrived at a point where imagination can recommend and reconcile itself to a realistic age only on condition of becoming real and actual. The general conclusion to be drawn from the most successful pictures of the year seems to be that the time is past when artists could safely build on the ideal according to the traditional meaning of the term; pictures reared on this unsubstantial basis are as houses built on the sand. And yet the only great future for art is, as it always has been, in the direction of the ideal. Nevertheless, experience within the Academy seems to prove that, unless an English painter can produce his ideal out of an English peasant or out of an English pastoral scene, he may possibly deserve promotion to some other planet, but will have very little chance of getting upon the line of the Academy.

HAMLET AT THE CRYSTAL PALACE.

THE weakness of the modern stage is proved by the contrivances which are adopted to conceal it. Admit all that can be said in favour of Mr. Tom Taylor's supposed improvements upon the stage traditions of *Hamlet*, and we still feel that a little good acting would be worth them all. We learn from the columns of a newspaper that the costumes have been correctly designed after examples of the thirteenth century; and we are tempted to ask, What of that? The characters of this play belong to Shakespeare's own time so far as they belong to any time. The manners and the talk of Hamlet and Horatio are those of gentlemen to whom the rapier and dagger were familiar, and it is a mistake to carry accuracy of detail so far as to dress Hamlet and Horatio in gowns which would have been sadly in their way if they had attempted to use these weapons. In seeking a representative of Hamlet it might be useful to remember that "the courtier's, soldier's, scholar's eye, tongue, sword," are all among his attributes, and his skill in the use of arms is not only talked about, but actually exhibited. Nature alone gives genius, and time is necessary for study; but a young actor who undertakes Hamlet ought at least to make himself as perfect as possible in those parts of his business which must be learned in youth, if they are to be learned completely. Aspirants to the tragic stage may usefully remember how much labour was gone through by those who in former times attained its highest honours. Charles Kean, who played Hamlet within the memory of many of us, was remarkable for attention to the mechanical parts of his profession, and in this respect he may be recommended as an example to Mr. Tom Taylor's novice. It is rather surprising that a pupil of eminent French teachers should be deficient in any of the accessories of good acting. The use of the sword is still taught in Paris, and it is a necessary accomplishment in an actor who is to play Hamlet. It is quite true that there are few persons in any theatre who can distinguish good fencing from bad, but everybody can appreciate that grace and dignity of bearing which the careful practice of fencing was formerly thought likely to confer.

It is almost ungrateful to criticize with any severity an attempt which is honestly directed towards the improvement of our stage. Mr. Tom Taylor is entitled to the approval and sympathy of all who care for the future of dramatic literature or art. We could wish, indeed, that there were less call for sympathy and more for congratulation. It is enough to break the heart of any manager to see his audience gradually melting away as the play which he has so elaborately produced draws to its close. But we doubt whether John Kemble himself, in the churchyard scene, could have kept some of last Saturday's audience at the Crystal Palace from their dinner. It was probably not foreseen that the play would last nearly four hours; and there are only certain trains by which visitors from London can return, and if everybody waited until the end of the programme, the train would be inconveniently crowded. Still it is strange that there should be a play good enough to see and yet not good enough to see the whole of. Perhaps it might not be amiss to consult the convenience of people who dine at seven o'clock by beginning on alternate days with the fifth act and playing backwards, so that the whole play may be seen at two sittings. There have been cities in which

the theatre occupied the most important place in the social arrangements of the day, but certainly London is not such a city. If Shakspeare is played in the evening people will not come, and if he is played in the afternoon they will come, but will not stay. If anybody said that three hours is enough of such entertainment as Mr. Tom Taylor provided last week, the remark would be undeniably true. The gentleman who acted Hamlet lost in physical power as his task proceeded, and certainly he gained in no other respect. The churchyard scene is ineffective, and the numerous deaths upon the stage make the last scene, even with the best acting, slightly ludicrous. In one respect the directors of the Crystal Palace may be congratulated. They undertook that "the smaller features of this great drama" should be completely represented, and in this they have succeeded.

It is, indeed, difficult to feel sanguine as to the results of Mr. Tom Taylor's undertaking. But, as he has leisure and ability, it is to be hoped that he may receive encouragement to persevere in it. The ample space of the Crystal Palace may perhaps afford a corner for the poetic drama; and if a good school of acting could be established there, the stage in London would be improved by it. But probably Mr. Tom Taylor, like other eminent artists, can only be had on his own terms. If he directs, others must obey; and we may suspect that the company he has collected is not absolutely the best that could be got, but the best that was willing to accept his instruction. The public, however, is not likely to be satisfied unless the best is done that circumstances admit. If there be a good actor able and willing to play any part, let him be engaged; and, on the other hand, let Mr. Tom Taylor be as far as possible at liberty to arrange minor details as he pleases. He points out in a note to his edition of *Hamlet* that the style of Osric's talk is a caricature of the euphuism of Shakspeare's day. This caricature would surely be made more complete by dressing Osric in the fashion of the same age. The gravediggers are unmistakably English of the same time, but the dresses of humble people do not vary much in successive ages, and Mr. Tom Taylor may say if he pleases that his gravediggers are of the thirteenth century. It might be interesting to consider how far this modern strictness as to costume is to be carried. Let us make the improbable supposition that *Troilus and Cressida* were revived. It would be a manager's obvious thought to claim credit for being strictly classical, yet the heroes of Shakspeare, although they bear Greek and Trojan names, would be much more at home on a mediæval battlefield than on the plain of Troy. But when Shakspeare thought it worth while, he could fix the time of a play, and make his characters keep to it in their talk. This is notably the case with *Julius Cæsar*, which contains very few expressions unsuitable to the manners of ancient Rome. Where Shakspeare has not attempted this accuracy, he probably did not think it worth while, and he was a tolerably good judge. He certainly has not attempted to fix the characters of *Hamlet* to any particular age, and the reason probably was that he had not made up his mind to what age the story of the play belonged. Indeed, if Mr. Tom Taylor is right in saying that the play was taken from a novel "founded on incidents in the mythic annals of Denmark," it is useless for us to attempt to arrive at greater certainty than Shakspeare possessed. We should say, let the dresses be handsome and harmonious with the acting, but do not place a manager in fetters from which the author kept himself free. As regards the dress of Hamlet himself, we should be satisfied without any improvement upon the well-known picture of John Kemble. The cloaks which Hamlet and Horatio wear deserve the denunciation of a German emperor of the selected period as serving neither for ornament nor use. They are too scanty for warmth, and yet long enough to impede motion. But if accuracy of detail were so very important as Mr. Tom Taylor thinks, it might be worth while to remark that Hamlet and Horatio appearing on the platform at Elsinore on a frosty night ought properly to be wrapped in cloaks capable of producing warmth.

We have dwelt thus at length upon this matter of dress because Mr. Tom Taylor has challenged attention to it, and we think that in the too eager pursuit of accuracy he has fallen into a serious mistake. "The phrase," says Hamlet, "would be more german to the matter if we could carry a cannon by our sides." This single sentence seems sufficient to prove our case against Mr. Tom Taylor. The character of Hamlet belongs to all time, and the circumstances of Hamlet belong to Shakspeare's own age. In the thirteenth century a duel between gentlemen, if fought on foot, would have been fought with sword, or axe, and shield. This is well shown by Laertes, who desires to refer his quarrel with Hamlet to "some elder masters of known honour," in accordance with the usage of polite nations at the time of writing. In Shakspeare's age the dagger was used in the left hand to parry thrusts made by the rapier held in the opponent's right hand. Captain Bobadil shall teach us how to use them—"Exalt not your point above this state, at any hand, and let your poniard maintain your defence thus!" At or after Shakspeare's time duels began to be fought with the rapier alone, and it was doubtless common in his time to fence with rapiers having buttons on the end, or "foils." The substitution of rapier and dagger for broadsword and target was lamented by writers who saw in it a proof of the degeneracy of the age. In a comedy of 1599 the complaint occurs—"Sword and buckler fight begins to grow out of use. I am sorry for it. I shall never see good manhood again. If it be once gone, this poking fight of rapier and dagger will come up; then a tall man and a good sword-and-buckler man

will be spitted like a cat or rabbit." We take this quotation from a note by Scott on that passage of the *Lady of the Lake* which describes the combat between Fitzjames and Roderick Dhu. Scott knew all about these things, and he had not omitted to consult in reference to them a book called *Illustrations of Shakespeare*, which is probably too old-fashioned to deserve Mr. Tom Taylor's notice. Yet the gradual disuse of armour is one of the most important features of Shakespeare's age, and this feature inevitably appears in any play which reflects the manners of that age. But ever since Mr. Fechter thought proper to play Hamlet in a yellow wig because he was a Dane, we have been overdone with details which, even if correct, have been unnecessary.

Let us not, however, omit to acknowledge the good which Mr. Tom Taylor has done by putting *Hamlet* into the hands of many hundreds of visitors to the Crystal Palace, and causing them to read it. Some of his remarks are valuable, and we particularly approve the note in which he dwells upon the "wonderful impressiveness and significance" of the opening scene of the play. It is difficult to complain of any excision of the text when Mr. Tom Taylor's abridgment occupies nearly four hours in performance; but we think that the sort of audience likely to be found at the Crystal Palace would appreciate the speech of Marcellus which refers to Christmas. The preface mentions that Mr. Tom Taylor did the work of excision himself, and found on comparison, as we can well believe, that the result agreed nearly with that stage edition which has been produced by three centuries of experience. Yet the wealth of Shakespeare's mind is shown by these cuttings of the diamond. Among them are the lines which teach that excessive grief for a father's death is opposed to reason, which still hath cried "This must be so." There are no lines in the play by which an audience would be more nearly touched. We think that Mr. Tom Taylor's exegesis of the word "cousin" in the last line of this speech verges on absurdity. The discovery that this word is addressed to Hamlet, and not spoken of him, reminds us of the discovery of another ingenious commentator, that Desdemona applies the words "My lord" to the Duke, and not to her husband. Some critics are too fond of a process which may be described as measuring a giant to a hair's breadth. However, on the whole we are content with Mr. Tom Taylor's work, and as the audience, or what remained of it, called for "author," we presume that they also were content with it. To prevent disappointment of future audiences, we may mention that the ghost of Shakespeare did not appear in answer to this call. The best that can be said of the performance is that it gained some genuine applause, which was particularly bestowed on the scene in the Queen's closet. The ghost was mechanically excellent, but we have heard much better elocution. It is quite possible that the actor of Hamlet may improve as practice gives him power and confidence, and by all means let him have a full and indulgent trial. The Directors of the Crystal Palace may usefully revert to that mission which they originally undertook of educating the people, and thus they may more effectually compete with the rival establishment at South Kensington. If they can collect an audience for young actors who will do their best in Shakespeare, both actors and audience are likely to be improved in the process. We cannot help remembering that one of the most recent aspirants to the part of Hamlet in London was a lady, Miss Bouverie, whose performance would compare favourably with that of last Saturday. We make this remark without the least desire to see this lady or any other in the part of Hamlet. But if these performances of Shakespeare should continue, as we earnestly hope they will, we think that all rising talent should have a chance. The public, we are sure, will allow handsomely for early difficulties, and will be especially generous to that diffidence which is so often combined with noble aspirations and latent talents of the highest order. We have freely recorded our impressions of last week's performance, not forgetting, however, that it was the first attempt of a difficult task. It is only necessary to add that every person who feels any interest in the poetic drama should see the play of *Hamlet* at the Crystal Palace, remembering during the performance Hamlet's own precept as to the treatment of the players.

REVIEWS.

DR. MANSEL.*

HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, we imagine, will not be very long remembered as Dean Mansel. His best and most valuable work was done before he became Dean of St. Paul's; and his claims to that high office were of a general rather than a special nature. He was a metaphysician essentially, a theologian only accidentally; and his theology was not of what is sometimes supposed to be the genuine deaconal type. A theory survives in some quarters, though it is grounded on instances of not the most recent date, that a deanery is just the position for a dangerously

original divine. Originality in an incumbent, or even in a canon, is generally out of place. It is not understood by the occupant of the next living or the next stall; it is suspected by the arch-deacon, and possibly snubbed by the bishop. Moreover, it cannot be quiet under such circumstances; it is a pent force, like that which causes the earthquake, and must work its way out somehow. Originality in a bishop is not like an earthquake, but like thunder and lightning. Whatever its value, it cannot be equally distributed through the length and breadth of a diocese; it runs rapidly along congenial substances, but does mischief among non-conductors; instead of warming and cheering, it flashes and fulminates. But an original dean is a comparatively safe person. He can develop himself without coming into unpleasant contact with either his equals, his inferiors, or his superiors. No one is obliged to read his books, very few persons are under the necessity of hearing him preach; he is entrenched against the bishop; he deals with the canons, for the most part, one at a time; and his cathedral, in the course of its existence, has heard much stranger sentiments than he is at all likely to utter. But Mansel's claim to a deanery was certainly not the abnormal nature of his opinions. He was orthodox in the highest degree—more orthodox, indeed, than men who, like him, are at once able, inquiring, and honest, can generally contrive to be. The cast of his mind led him to dwell, not on theology in itself, but on theology in its relation to philosophy. His power of mind was such that he was likely to do well whatever he attempted; yet we may be well acquainted with his writings without being able to conjecture what distinctive features he would have contributed to the Speaker's Commentary as a commentator on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. His Bampton Lectures are his most important effort in the direction of theology; and their negative character is sufficiently indicated by their title—"The Limits of Religious Thought examined." Philosophy was employed in the lectures not to investigate thoroughly a certain field, but to disable other forms of philosophy from entering upon it; and the limits of religious thought were examined as contrasted with its contents. What is perhaps more remarkable, there is an absence of originality in Mansel's philosophy as well as in his theology. He has ventured on the prophecy that, if ever the time shall come when the philosophy of the Conditioned shall occupy its fitting place as the handmaid and auxiliary of Christian truth, the name of Sir William Hamilton will stand, most consulted and most revered, among the fathers and teachers of that philosophy. The prediction is made in a hypothetical and guarded form, which will in all probability prevent it from ever being brought into contact with the severe test of fact; but, of the thinkers who have any confidence in its ultimate fulfilment, few indeed would be inclined to modify it by substituting the name of Mansel for that of Hamilton. Mansel applied with great ingenuity and perseverance a metaphysical system which he modified very little. He showed himself a model disciple, and did not aspire to be a master.

The volume of Mansel's minor writings, which has been carefully edited by Mr. Chandler, consists for the most part of articles, lectures, and letters, relating either to philosophy as a separate subject, or to philosophy in its bearings on theology. Two articles on Sensation Novels and Modern Spiritualism, which were contributed to the *Quarterly Review*, are in a lighter strain, and an article on Freethinking, which appeared in the same Review, is exceptional, as being of an historical cast. We have also the witty dramatic fragment, *Phrontisterion*, which was called forth by proposed changes in the constitution of the University of Oxford, some of which have now become historical facts, and have so passed out of the jocular region. With the exception of an unfinished article on the Idealism of Berkeley, all the papers are earlier in date than Mansel's appointment to the chair of Ecclesiastical History. It would seem that the intellectual energy which made comparatively light of metaphysics was for the time absorbed, first by the novel duties of a not very congenial professorship, and afterwards by the practical work of a deanery—work which is easy enough on paper, but is sometimes found to absorb, in the case of a beginner, a great deal of time and attention. We may suppose that Mansel's literary activity was just resuming its accustomed play when he was removed by an untimely death.

The papers now before us, though for the most part familiar to readers who have cared in former years to follow the course of Mansel's mind, supply in their present form a collection of material which brings vividly before us his characteristics as a thinker. Few men indeed have known metaphysical science so well, used it so freely, and trusted it so little. In spite of their form, Mansel's intellectual attempts were the reverse of ambitious; he was like the defender of a besieged city who tries to drive back assailants with weapons snatched from their hands, and whose ingenuity is chiefly shown in meeting contrivance with contrivance. He never yielded to the fascinations of those great schemes of intellectual conquest in which the majority of young metaphysicians indulge as a matter of course. He had a special faculty for abstract reasoning, but nothing could be more moderate than his estimate of what it could accomplish. The duty of philosophy, he said, is not to transcend consciousness, but to make consciousness at unity with itself; the office of philosophy is but the articulate expression of consciousness. The thesis which he maintained in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Metaphysics was that psychology is the test of moral and metaphysical philosophy; and before the lecture was concluded, he told his hearers that, by means of a cautious psychological procedure, they might hope either to lay a foundation in facts for the construction of a metaphysical system,

* *Letters, Lectures, and Reviews, including the Phrontisterion, or, Oxford in the Nineteenth Century.* By the Very Rev. Henry Longueville Mansel, D.D., sometime Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College; Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Magdalen College; Professor of Ecclesiastical History; Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and Dean of St. Paul's. Edited by Henry W. Chandler, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. London: John Murray. 1873.

or at any rate to show why such a system could not be constructed, and what is the origin and real meaning of the delusion which has led men to dream of its possibility. That no manipulation of mental facts can enable us to transcend consciousness is the conclusion to which many sensible men have been led by the study of mental science. When they have reached it, they leave off thinking about thought, and choose some other employment for their minds; and it is certainly strange to find a young metaphysician, with a whole world of speculation before him, accepting as an important truth what they have found so discouraging. The terminology of which Mansel was a master, and to which for some purposes he trusted, was originally meant as the scaffolding of a bridge that was to connect the world of being with the world of knowing. We may be quite sure that it was the hope of real discovery which led the fathers of speculation to leave common sense behind, and trust themselves to a restless sea of abstractions. Even now it seems to many of us that it is the peculiar privilege of earnest thought to be in some way superior to its premises; to guess, to muse, to meditate, to dream, yet possibly to verify the dream after all. Intellectual enthusiasm, like strong affection, seems to carry us out of ourselves to an object. The ardent metaphysician has a faith which is to him like that of religion, the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. To such ardour Mansel could give but scanty encouragement. The very words with which he recommended the study of metaphysics sound almost like an apology for failure. He told the learners who came to listen to the first burst of his professional energy that metaphysical inquiry, whether it succeed or fail in its ultimate object, cannot be otherwise than a wholesome and instructive discipline of the mind; like the labourers in the fable, its votaries may not succeed in finding the buried treasure for which they turn up the soil, yet their labours will have prepared the intellectual field for its proper harvest, and they may hope to attain a knowledge more valuable perhaps than that for which they sought—a knowledge of themselves and of their powers, of what they may and what they may not aspire to know, of the laws and limits of reason, and, by consequence, of the just claims of faith. Good sense, no doubt; yet it is a poor recommendation of a study to begin by depreciating its powers; to hint that its bow will not carry far, nor its arrow hit the mark. It is a very peculiar intellect which can work on indefinitely in the dim hope of finding something which it does not seek, and of attaining at last to the measure of its own incapacity.

It would seem at first sight that Mansel did not take the same depreciating view of logic as of metaphysics. For formal logic, at least, which rejects all empirical elements, he has high terms of praise. All formal thinking, he tells us, is governed by laws which may be expressed in analytical judgments, while all material thinking is governed by laws which may be expressed in synthetical judgments. The former are uniform in their operation, and can therefore completely guarantee the validity of thought; the latter are modified in their operation by their combination with experience, and can therefore only partially guarantee the validity of one element of thought. Hence the former may be described as *pure*, *adequate*, or *positive* laws of formal thinking; while the latter may be described as *mixed*, *inadequate*, or *negative* laws of material thinking. When logic has been further defined as the science of the laws of formal thinking, it would naturally strike a person who had neither special knowledge of the subject nor an exact appreciation of all the terms employed, that logic ought to be an exceedingly useful thing. The laws on which it is grounded are, as it appears, pure, adequate, and positive; they are sufficient in themselves for an act of thought, they are uniform in their operation, and a perfect guarantee of the validity of the mental process. But, alas! according to Mansel, the instrument becomes useless for the discovery of positive truth the moment an endeavour is made to apply it. It can detect some forms of inaccuracy, but cannot exclude error; it is no guarantee for the result of any process in which thought operates in conjunction with perception and memory. This decision may remind us of the famous case between the nose and the eyes about the spectacles. It seems to the popular mind much the same thing to say that the eyes must be shut whenever the nose wears the spectacles, as to say that the science of formal thinking ceases to be trustworthy when memory and perception are not dissociated from thought. But Kant has demonstrated that a criterion of material truth is not only impossible, but self-contradictory; and Mansel has asserted that an innovator who attempts to enlarge the field of logic only makes it impossible to assign to it any definite field whatever. A view on which Kant and Mansel agree is of course not to be ridiculed or lightly set aside. Their estimate of logic may be allowed the formal validity which is all they claim for it; and it is only mentioned here in order to show the thoroughly consistent character of Mansel's thought. A formal logic, entirely emptied of contents, and a metaphysic devoted to ascertain the limits of something external to itself, correspond to each other like the concave and convex sides of a curve. But the material element, which he excluded from prominence on scientific grounds, might have entered as it were by a back door. Logicians have not only to maintain theories and formulate opinions; they have also to give illustrations. Metaphysicians may communicate a lively impression of their general sentiments and tone of mind when they are attacking or defending an hypothesis of essentially speculative interest. We may know what manner of man Berkeley was from reading his works without consulting a biography. Archbishop Whately and Mr. J. S. Mill have con-

trived to materialize their works on Logic to quite a sufficient extent; so that the reader may imbibe from them, if he please, not formal thought merely, but views on social science, theology, physics, and political economy. Some very clever proselytizing may be accomplished, or at least attempted, by a logician who illustrates the truth from his own opinions, and seeks his examples of the different kinds of fallacy from schools of thought with which he does not sympathize. Illustrations which indicate the private tastes and habits of the writer may be excluded of set purpose from elaborate works on grave subjects; but the detail which would be out of place in a Bampton Lecture may come in both appositely and gracefully in a flying pamphlet or a lively contribution to a magazine. If, however, we look over Mansel's minor writings in order to see on which food his mind fed in private, we shall meet with a somewhat remarkable phenomenon. When he was not metaphysical or logical, he was poetical or facetious. He was well read in mental philosophy, whether Greek, German, French, or English; he was also at home in Horace, and Rabelais, and Hudibras, and modern novels; but his references to subjects not theological, which interest grave men in their more serious moments, are few and far between. Political economy, that favourite exercise-ground of logicians, seems quite removed from his consciousness. A stray reference to Dr. Carpenter's *Human Physiology* strikes us like a portent; and, when examined, it is seen not to relate to any subtle question as to the normal bearing of nervous organization on mind, but to some of the most vulgar manifestations of modern spiritualism. Mr. Darwin, in like manner, is introduced on account of a supposed resemblance between his theory of development and some nonsense indited by a medium personating Tom Paine; and elsewhere we are told that all the varieties of sensational literature may be referred to a source in the same original germ by a law of generation at least as worthy of the attention of the scientific student as that by which Mr. Darwin's bear may be supposed to have developed into a whale. In such references as these there is nothing whatever to indicate that Mansel had given serious thought to the theory to which he refers; but poetry was evidently frequently present to his mind, supplying him, as the case might be, with grave reflections or light fancies; and the clever Aristophanic fragment of *Phronisterion* establishes a presumption that the poetical vein which undoubtedly lay in his nature would have repaid more earnest and continued working.

It is better, perhaps, to leave off here, and not either to introduce matter which has little affinity with the volume edited by Mr. Chandler, or to run the risk of seeming to build a theory on a literary record which is confessedly fragmentary and imperfect. If Mansel had been intellectually audacious, he could have theorized like Hegel; if he had been careless and indifferent, he could have matched the scepticism of Hume; if he had been irreverent, he could have scoffed like Heine; if he had been frivolous, he could perhaps have rivalled the *Ingoldsby Legends*. But he was neither audacious, nor careless, nor irreverent, nor frivolous; he would be far better described by the reverse of all these epithets. He did some valuable work in a truly remarkable manner, and we may wonder at him the more, without admiring him the less, if we have reason to think that his mind, which could grasp metaphysical abstractions so firmly as almost to compress them into solidity, and could find relief both in diving and soaring on the wings of imagination, was comparatively indifferent to whole families of subjects which seem to the majority of earnest men at the present day to have a reality which is wanting in metaphysics, and a more abiding interest than can be found in fiction.

THE PAINS OF MEMORY.*

A MODERN poet has won much popularity by singing the praise of the "Pleasures of Memory," but surely a companion volume of groans about its pains ought to find still greater acceptance with the general run of mankind, whose memories, if they have any, seem to be nothing but a source of torment to them. We can imagine no one better fitted to carry out the idea of thus immortalizing the mental agonies of his fellow-sufferers than the student, if any such can be found, who has learnt by rote the 591 lines which compose the *English History in Rhyme* published by Mr. Goodwin as a help to students of English History. Within that short compass Mr. Goodwin has strung together in doggerel verses, in almost every known, and some hitherto unknown, measures, a number of hard names of people and places connected more or less closely with the history of our island, from the first landing of Caesar to the last Thanksgiving in St. Paul's, with which important event he closes his work. This hard task he has undertaken from motives of pure benevolence, if we may believe his preface. He there tells us that

These Rhymes are published in the belief that they will very materially assist those who are preparing for UNIVERSITY, MILITARY, NAVAL, CIVIL SERVICE, AND OTHER EXAMINATIONS, in which an acquaintance with the facts of English History is required; their utility having already been proved in the experience of the author with his own pupils.

Mr. Goodwin has cast a pitying eye on those luckless wights who are year by year forced by a hard fate to rush into the very jaws of

* *English History in Rhyme*. By Edward B. Goodwin. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

The Scholars' Home Lesson-Book. Geography. London: T. Murby.

The Humanity Series of School Books. Edited by the Rev. F. O. Morris, B.A. London: T. Murby.

certain monsters called examiners. He has made ready for these poor defenceless lambs a complete coat of mail that shall be proof against the sharpest fangs of the wily old wolves whose set purpose is to worry them. Once let a candidate have learnt through the 591 lines of Mr. Goodwin's History, and, if he can but remember them, he will be armed at all points. There will be no possibility of smiting him between the joints of his harness, so absolutely disjointed will the harness be.

Swiftly and silently Mr. Goodwin gets over his ground. In sixteen lines he gets through all the dealings of the Romans with Britain. Yet, narrow as his limits are, he finds room to tell us that Caradoc, or Caradoc as he calls him, wondered "Why Claudius should envy my home." This expression of sentiment on the part of the simple savage is clearly only given us because our rhymist found himself at a loss for a suitable rhyme to Rome. It is somewhat inconsistent with this amount of detail about the British patriot to find the English one, Earl Waltheof, cut short with half a line. Yet all we find about him is—

For concurrence with Roger Earl Waltheof died.

What "concurrence" may mean we are by no means sure. It must be used here in some very subtle sense; for, while Roger did concur, Ralph it seems did not, as his name is not brought forward in the matter. We would counsel our rhymist, before he perpetrates the Grecian and Roman Histories in rhyme with which we see we are threatened, to study the simplicity of some of his brother bards of former days. Take, for instance, the couplet in which the cobbler bard, the shoemaker who did well in not sticking to his last, is thus drawn with a few graphic touches:—

Hans Sachs was a shoe-maker
And a poet too.

What can be more simple, true, and impartial? Where could Mr. Goodwin find a better model? It is too much to expect students who are so pressed for time that they must have the Norman Conquest and all the changes it wrought told off to them in eighteen lines to stop and ponder over a word of such doubtful meaning as "concurrence." We suppose the foot-notes in Mr. Goodwin's little book are intended to "concur" with the rhymes, as we are told that these "foot-notes have been added for ready reference, and it is hoped they may be found useful in furnishing concise answers to some questions of likely occurrence." What the questions are likely to be we cannot take upon us to determine, but we rather think the notes will furnish some very unlikely answers, owing to the perfect impartiality with which they mix up truth and fiction.

In Note 16 to the Saxon Period, for example, we are told the story of Ælfryth treacherously murdering her stepson; while Note 17 records the Massacre of St. Brice; but which is true and which is false, or whether both are true or both are false, the student is left to his own inspirations to determine. Sometimes the notes take for granted an amazing amount of information on the part of the students, as in Note 10 to Henry the Third, where we read:—"By the Treaty called the 'Mise of Lewes,' Prince Edward and Henry, son of the King of the Romans, were taken in exchange for the King." This looks very much as if Mr. Goodwin was a little too anxious to air his own information, and to let every one know that he at least knows all about the King of the Romans. But, after all, since it was as the English King's nephew, and not as Henry of Almain, that Henry was given as a hostage, it might have been as well to say somewhere that Richard of Cornwall and the King of the Romans were one and the same person.

It seems to be a commonly received superstition that the memory is a sort of ballot-box into which must be crammed all manner of facts. There, by some queer sort of necromancy, they are expected to assort themselves, so that the right fact shall come out just at the right time. This at least is the principle upon which all the so-called Aids to Memory are put together. Memory, however, takes her revenge by mixing up the treasures thus confided to her topsy-turvy and turning them out all wrong. Hence the wonderful jumbles of blunders to be found in the answers to examination papers. Nowadays, when memory, like the rest of our faculties, seems to be getting weaker as the world grows older, a good memory would certainly be the most useful gift that a kind fairy godmother could bestow. The child thus gifted, by remembering exactly everything he had ever read, or heard, or seen, would have a wonderful advantage over his fellows. As it is, even a moderately good memory often passes for talent, and wins for its owner a share of that respect, strongly tinged with dislike, which society feels for so-called "clever people." But good memories are rare. Very few among us can lay claim to them. Most people complain grievously of the sad tricks memory plays them, and resort to all sorts of desperate devices, such as tying knots in their handkerchiefs whenever they want to remember anything, though they are themselves perfectly aware that in half an hour they will have forgotten utterly what the knots were tied for. There is, in truth, no end to the odd contrivances by which people try to make crutches for their shattered memories, while, if they would only throw away the crutches and have confidence in their own power of remembering, they would find themselves perfectly able to do so. Surely it is much easier to remember the date of any given event by calling to mind the state of affairs or the current of events at the same time in other places than by going through an elaborate and perfectly unintelligible calculation by way of getting at it; yet we have known persons who professed inability to remember the date

of the Norman Conquest save by reckoning that it took place exactly thirty-four years before the year 1100. If we must have technical memories, we prefer the old-fashioned sentences which used to find great acceptance in ladies' schools, by means of which, on repeating certain commonplace propositions, such as "The Spartans ate black broth," the initiated could tell you every possible date from the building of Nineveh downwards. Dates so remembered are practically useless. They can have no ideas attached to them, and they therefore lose their only real importance as connecting links in the unbroken chain of history. As for all metrical helps to memory, they are very shaky props indeed. The jingle of rhyme at the end of the line is all that memory holds, and one name is just as good as another to fill up the void in the middle. Can the following incoherent jumble of hard names be a help to any sane person in remembering the always puzzling battles of the Peninsular War?—

Vimiera Arthur Wellesley gained. Dalrymple made "Convention."
Corunna, Talavéra, and Walcheren, claim attention.
Busaco, Fuentes, Albuera, Ciudad, Badajoz, too,
Battles at Salamanca and Vittoria speak of loss to
France, whose force at Pampeluna and Toulouse was scattered,
And Buonaparte, at Leipsic beaten, found his prospects shattered.

In old times it was thought that memory was only skin-deep, and could be best got at by inflicting bodily pain; hence the custom of beating boys to fix in their memories the bounds of the parishes. On this belief the German schoolmaster acted when he pulled his pupils' ears each time they passed through the gate of the city to impress on them how the French had robbed it of one of its fairest ornaments. For our own part, we should much prefer either being beaten or having our ears pulled to learning by rote the 591 lines which Mr. Goodwin has put together for the benefit of his unhappy pupils. But if any one has a fancy for exercising his memory on such tough work, we think he might just as well try it with a few pages of *Bradshaw* or a column or two of a *London Directory*. We are sure that he would find these exercises quite as interesting, and very nearly as instructive, so far as concerns real history.

History naturally suggests geography, as the one cannot be taught to any good purpose without the other; yet it is strange how far people are from understanding this. If there is one branch of useful knowledge about which the general run of mankind are shamefully ignorant, it is geography. In this, to be sure, we are not a whit behind other nations. The average Frenchman believes that somehow or other every part of England is within easy walking range of London. And we have met with Germans who stubbornly maintained that Blucher only just saved the English from being driven into the sea at Waterloo. Still, two blacks will never make a white, and the ignorance of other nations can be no reason why the British public, boasting as it does of being the most commercial nation in the world, should not know something about the countries with which its trade is chiefly carried on, and, above all, about its own colonies. It is high time that young ladies should know better than to ask acquaintances on the eve of a voyage to Australia to be sure to call on their cousins in New Zealand, or to express a hope that travellers just arrived from Buenos Ayres had had a quiet time coming round the Horn. And yet geography is very much taught, and the little manuals that present themselves for teaching it are legion. The *Scholars' Home Lesson-Book*, one of the last recruits on the list, seems to us to be no whit in advance of its fellows, nor can we find in turning over its pages any new ideas in the way of teaching that might be said to justify its publication. It is like the greater part of such little books, a dry collection of the names of places; and where any lights, either philological or political, are thrown out, they are so very dark that we can only wish that they had been left out altogether. When we find all the Romance tongues spoken of as "Greek-Latin," and the Cinque Ports ranged among the things that were, but are no longer, we cannot but mourn over this sowing of tares to be uprooted in after years. There is no lesson which children like better than geography when it is rationally taught, none that can be made more attractive to them; and yet there is none that is more invariably made distasteful and unintelligible. What is the use of starting off by telling a child in his first geography lesson the number of continents in the world, or by calling on him to remember into how many zones the earth's surface is divided? Would it not be better to work upon his experience of the little bit of that surface on which he lives; to show him what a map means, and on what scale places can be represented on it, by letting him draw one for himself, with all the streams, fields, roads, and streamlets in the parish marked upon it. In this way only can children learn that the black lines wriggling across the sheets mean something more than the cracks in a teacup, and that the conventional mountains of the modern map-drawer are not meant for woolly caterpillars after all, but for hills, higher no doubt than, but still the same in character as, those behind which he himself may any evening watch the sun go down. As things are at present, children learn the names and find the places on the map with very little understanding of the meaning of the different signs marked upon it. We once heard a really clever child, fresh from a geography lesson, while trying to trace a likeness between a pool by the wayside and the Mediterranean Sea, add by way of explanation that of course the pool was much the larger of the two. A child's knowledge of the world is confined to its own hamlet, or at most to its own parish. Surely a wise teacher should act upon this, and, taking this certainty for

the starting-point, extend the lessons from the parish to the county, from the county to the kingdom, and so on till the ever-increasing circles have taken in, not only our own world, but also all that science can teach us of the other worlds that form the universe.

We turn with a feeling of relief to the reading-books of Mr. Morris. They make no pretensions to being the medleys of general knowledge to which the common run of primers lay claim. Still we have a crow to pick with him about his title, which is surely a misnomer. When we first turned over his pages, we were grievously disappointed to find that the word "Humanity" has fallen from its ancient dignity, that it no longer means Latin as the only study worthy of the human intellect, and that the *Humanity Series* is neither more nor less than a collection of pleasant little tales intended to interest children in the welfare of their fellow-animals. We wish Mr. Morris all success in this praiseworthy effort, and we hope that his books will find a welcome in all elementary schools. To teach children to love animals will not only do away with a great deal of useless suffering to the animals, but will also open a new source of happiness to the children themselves. The child will surely be a happier child who through long lonely days of out-door work can find "friends in fur and feathers" all around him, and who, like St. Francis, sees a little brother or sister in every living thing that chance may bring across his path. It is a pity that more of the tales are not told in the first person. Children like tales about animals, but then to interest them the stories must be told by the animals themselves; the children like to feel as if they were taken behind the scenes into the real animal world, instead of merely looking on as outsiders. We cannot but wish that Mr. Morris had stuck to his text, and had kept solely to the tales about animals which he promises us in his preface. We would gladly have seen the moral pieces which are mixed with them left out. Surely it must provoke a smile, even from the most solemn teacher, to find Napoleon Bonaparte quoted as an example to prove the profit of daily reading of the Scriptures; unless indeed he confined his reading strictly to those parts of the Old Testament which Ulfilas left untranslated as being more likely to inflame than to soften the warlike spirit of his Goths.

THE FORTESCUE PAPERS.*

EITHER time flits away yet faster than we thought it did, or else this book has not been in our hands so long as might be thought from its date. We hardly see why it should have been called the *Fortescue Papers*, a title which certainly made us expect to find Sir John or Sir Faithful, or some other bearer of the name of Fortescue, as the writer or receiver of the letters. But they are called *Fortescue Papers*, simply because the originals are in the possession of the Hon. G. M. Fortescue, to whom we doubtless owe our thanks for allowing Mr. Gardiner to make use of them, but who has hardly a claim to give his name to the collection. They belong to the time which Mr. Gardiner has made specially his own, the reign of James the First, ranging from 1607 to 1625, with the exception of a single letter of Charles the First to Prince Rupert in 1644. Of five hundred and eight papers Mr. Gardiner has picked out a hundred and sixty-one, and even of these he says that there are some which he should not have printed if the originals had been easily accessible in a public library. Mr. Gardiner need not be afraid on this head. Of things which are, even in a humble kind of way, real materials for history it is better to print too much than too little. Camden Society books are meant for a special world of their own, and not to lie about on the drawing-room tables of the general public. Few people, even of the special world of the Camden Society, are likely to read such a collection as this all through, or to find matter of interest in every letter; but a great many will find something to their own purpose here and here, and perhaps there is no letter which will not prove of some value to somebody. Take for instance the letters of an earlier date, which Mr. Gardiner does not put in the body of the work, but points and comments on in the preface. There is nothing in itself particularly interesting in the two courtships of Sir Thomas Hobby to Margaret, widow first of a Devereux and then of a Sidney—the unsuccessful courtship in the first widowhood and the successful one in the second. But we learn something from it about the manners and feelings of the times, when we see that the success of the suitor is not at all left to depend wholly on the choice of the widow herself, but that various great personages are called in to back up his cause, and that he fails the first time because other great personages are backing up the cause of a rival. Moreover the old prejudice which in earlier times had deprived the widow of her estate if she married *infra annum luctus* had no being now. Walter Devereux has not been dead a fortnight before Lord Burghley himself is writing letters to divers persons to get hold of the widow, and with her the lands of Hackness in Yorkshire, for his wife's nephew Hobby. Mr. Gardiner suggests that the Lord Treasurer had something more in view than merely to make the fortune of a young man who was bound to him by ties of affinity. Hackness lay in a district which was full of recusants, and it might be for the welfare of Church and State to get the estate of Hackness, and the influence which would go with it, into the hands of a sound Protestant. However this may be, Burghley's

schemes, public or private, came to nought. The widow was under the special protection of the Countess of Huntingdon and her lord, and Huntingdon, then Lord President of the North, may in Yorkshire have been looked on as a greater person than the Lord Treasurer. Lady Huntingdon also had a nephew to provide for, and the widowed Margaret, before her year was up, became the wife of Thomas Sidney, brother of the famous Sir Philip. The next time Hobby, now Sir Thomas, succeeded, but perhaps more because the widow was afraid of otherwise losing her estate by a Chancery suit than for any other cause. Lord Burghley appears again, and Lord Huntingdon also. In the body of the book we in the like sort find the Duke of Buckingham and other men in power meddling in the same way about people's marriages. The Hobby story also tells us something in the history of nomenclature. Our persevering knight bore the name of Thomas Posthumus, a yet earlier case of a double name than Anthony Ashley Cooper. But, as in the Ashley case, there was a special reason for so unusual a caprice, as Thomas Hobby was born after the death of his father.

Turning to the body of the book, the letters seem to be just such a collection as Buckingham's secretary might be expected to make. A large part of them are letters addressed to Buckingham in his various stages as Sir George Villiers, Viscount Villiers, Earl, Marquess and Duke of Buckingham, while a good many are to Packer himself. The correspondence of both master and secretary gets as high as sovereign princes; Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, writes to the all-powerful favourite to use his influence with her father on behalf of her husband; and old Frederick himself writes, "De mon chateau Royal de Prague," to M. Packer, signing himself "Vostre affectionné amy Frideric." Otherwise Packer's letters come very largely from bishops, and chief among them the Lord Keeper, Bishop Williams, who writes to Packer as "Your assured loving friend," while he writes to Packer's master as "Your lordship's most faithful servant and creature." A good number of the letters from ecclesiastical persons naturally consist of requests for preferment. Thus we find Dr. John Bowle writing to Buckingham as one whom "it pleaseth your honour to rank in the number of your orators whom you please to respect," making his petition on this wise:—

Since now it hath pleased God to take the Bishop of Norwich to his mercy, these lines do humbly intreat your Honor to lodge mee in that number whome your Honor will advance by this alteration. The Deanery of Westminster, wher I went to schoole, or some such place, is the utmost of my desire, wher I myght serve my God, and dayly praye for his Majesty and your Honor.

The letter is dated May 18, and Mr. Gardiner gives the year as 1620; but the Bishop of Norwich spoken of must be Overall, who died May 12, 1619, so one would think that it rather belonged to that year. Anyhow, we may note the two different kinds of euphemism by which the death of the Bishop is described, first of all as a "taking to God's mercy," and secondly as "this alteration." Bowle did not get the "utmost of his desire" in the form of the Deanery of Westminster, which was given to Williams, and which Williams moreover contrived to keep after his promotion to the bishopric of Lincoln. But he did get "some such place" in the form of the Deanery of Salisbury; and in the next reign, in 1630, he was consecrated to the see of Rochester, which he kept for the remaining seven years of his life. Bowle however seems to have hoped to get moved from Salisbury to Westminster on the promotion of Williams to his bishopric; but he "most unwillingly gave way to Williams retaining thereof." And this brings in a much more famous man than Bowle, namely, Dr. John Donne, who writes to Buckingham in what we are not twisting his own metaphors if we call a creeping and crawling fashion:—

May it please your Lordship. Ever since I had your Lordship's letter, I have esteemed myselfe in possession of Salisbury; and, more then Salisbury, of a place in your service; for I tooke Salisbury as a seat of ytt. I hear that my Lord Keeper finds reason to continue in Westminster; and I know that neyther your Lordship nor he knows how narrow and penurious a fortune I wrestle with in this world. But I am so far from depending upon the assistance of any but your Lordship, as that I do not assist myselfe so far as with a wishe that my Lord Keeper would have left a hole for so poore a worme as I am to have crept in at. All that I meane in usinge this boldnes, of puttinge myselfe into your Lordship's presence by this ragge of paper, ys to tell your Lordship that I ly in a corner, as a clodd of clay, attendinge what kinde of vessell yt shall please you to make of

Your Lordships

Humblest and thankfullest and devotedst servant,

J. DONNE.

Theophilus Field, Bishop of Llandaff, writes also in a very humble strain to his "ever acknowledged and (next to God and the King) most adored, best patron." Setting forth, not without reason, the sad estate of his "poore lamentably ruined church of Landaffe, whose revennewes (being the very sinewes of any sea) are shranke from a thousand pounds yeare to seaven skore pounds." Robert Snowdon, Bishop of Carlisle, writes also to Buckingham:—"I first admired you for the excellences of your person, nature and comportment, but now I tenne times more honor you your vertues and religion testified and recommended to the world by the most judicious and most renowned monarch that ever swayed the sceptre of Great Brytaine." This piece of flattery, as far as the King is concerned, is at least prudent, seeing that before the British Solomon no monarch, judicious or otherwise, had ever swayed the sceptre of Great Britain by that name.

But there are things of wider interest in this collection, though the cringing of churchmen, even of such a man as Donne, to one so worthless as Buckingham, is a sign of the times which is not to be passed by. Mr. Gardiner in his preface calls attention to the

* The Fortescue Papers; consisting chiefly of Letters relating to State Affairs, collected by John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. Printed for the Camden Society. 1871.

letter which stands thirty-four in his series, one addressed by King James to the Commissioners for the examination of Sir Walter Raleigh, and bearing date October 20, 1618. The letter is in answer to one from the Commissioners to the King which is printed in Bacon's works, and it explains the nature of the proceedings against Raleigh before the Commissioners. One chief point in the letter is that, as Mr. Gardiner says, it "shows that, at least in James's eyes, it was proved that Raleigh had recommended an attack on the Mexico fleet very early in the voyage." Two courses, it seems, had been proposed, one to summon Raleigh before the Privy Council, the other to put him at once to death on his old sentence, putting forth in print "a narrative of his crimes." James's wisdom determined to follow a middle course. Raleigh was to be brought before the Commissioners, to be accused by the Attorney-General, the warrant to be sent for his execution, and a declaration to be put forth in print. In this declaration the King says:—

Wherein we hold the French Physitian's confession very material to be inserted, as also his own and his consorts confession that, before they were at the Isles, he told them his ayme was at the fleet, with his son's oration when they came to the town, and some touch of his hateful speeches of our person.

The reasons which he gives for not calling him before the Council are also remarkable:—

And for the other course of a public calling him before our Counsell, we think it not fit, because it would make him too popular, as was found by experience at his arraignment at Winchester, where by his wit he turned the hatred of men into compassion of him. Secondly, it were too great honor to him to have that course taken against one of his sort, which we have observed never to have been used but toward persons of great quality, as namely the Countesse of Shrewsbury, and some such.

There are other letters of King James; the book begins with two written by him to Henry the Fourth of France, the first being about John Forbes, who had had a hand in an alleged illegal ecclesiastical synod held at Aberdeen in 1605, and who was now in France under the protection of Henry. One of his crimes, according to James, was "qu'il vous a celé (pour le moins a ce que nous divisons de voz lettres) qu'il estoit ministre, ains se disant gentilhomme." In the second, in 1609, touching the unjust dealings of the Pope, Paul V., and the "libelles diffamatoires" which had "sorty de la boutique Romaine," he holds forth on Henry's position as Most Christian King, defender of the liberties of the Gallican Church, and especially of the Pragmatic Sanction, which he says "fust premierement institué et establi par un d'iceux [vos predecesseurs] si Catholique qu'il en eust le tiltre de Lodovicus Pius." We can bear witness that the same confusion between St. Louis and the Emperor Lewis the Pious has been made in later times, but we should hardly have looked for such a blunder from the judicious and renowned monarch so worshipped by Bishop Snowden.

We will end with a domestic touch. In Letter XVIII. the Electress Elizabeth, not yet Queen of Bohemia, writes to her father, we know not why, in French; but she has at one point to fall back on her native tongue. She writes to ask that her mother and brother will be good enough "de lever au basteme le petit *black babie* que j'ay eu dernièrement." Mr. Gardiner quotes Mr. Green for Elizabeth's use of the same phrase *black babie* for her first child also, and he adds "P = 'black doll.'" Mr. Gardiner is certainly right in his suggestion, for the word "baby" meant "doll," at least as late as Addison's time.

OLD KENSINGTON.*

THIS is the longest story Miss Thackeray has as yet published; it is in many respects the most interesting; it is certainly that which gives us the highest impression of the richness and power of her genius. Those who know her other novels will hardly need to be told that the interest of this one does not lie mainly in the plot or the narrative. Of plot, as one used the word in those old days when secrets were hinted at and the reader's expectations were wrought up till a point arrived at which everything was disclosed and explained, and everybody's future lot was definitely settled—of plot in this sense there is comparatively little. Few events of consequence happen; and even those minor incidents without which no tale can move seem to us introduced not so much because they determine the fate of the personages as for the sake of revealing their characters and modes of feeling. Every occurrence in one's life has of course both aspects; the difference between the novel of plot and the novel of character lies in the prominence given to one or the other. Now in Miss Thackeray's hands the events and their results on the outer life of the personages are almost swept out of sight and forgotten in the feeling with which the whole is suffused, and which gives us an interest in them altogether above the novel-reader's commonplace curiosity "to know how it all ended." In the dreamy, half-hopeful, half-regretful effect it produces, her book seems like a piece of plaintive music, which for its chords has the ever-varying lights and shadows of human feeling, and those colours of the sky and clouds which she brings before us as the background to every scene. The story is indeed exquisitely tender and harmonious; but along with its dreaminess there is a curiously keen power of observation, and of throwing out striking reflections upon character and society. All novelists, one might almost say all writers of a really high order, must of course combine imagination and reflection; but many, and

those sometimes the greatest, are not successful in blending these two elements, but either disconnect their musings and speculations from the thread of the story, or allow it to appear that they have constructed the story to illustrate some view or moral lesson or psychological theory, and have seen their characters in its light. Miss Thackeray's art is more perfect in nothing than in this, that her reflections and comments seem always to arise naturally from the words and deeds of her personages, rather than to have themselves suggested to her the latter. In fact, there is no better way of testing for one's self the presence or absence of the true dramatic faculty than by inquiring what is the process which is followed in constructing an imaginary character. If one possesses that faculty, one begins by getting an idea—how it is hard to describe—of the person as a whole, conceives of him as living, and feels somehow what he might be expected to say and do under particular circumstances, just as we feel about the people we meet in the world and have a chance of studying. One may then, if one pleases, go on to moralize upon motives, and spin theories about human action generally, without necessarily destroying the illusion. But if the theory comes first, and the thoughts and acts of the character are afterwards invented to suit it, the conception will want life; and the reflections themselves will lose half their point, because we perceive that they are the framework upon which the whole has been constructed. The dicta and musings which we find in *Old Kensington* are so apposite where they are placed, that they suffer seriously by being extracted. Nevertheless we must venture to select a few:—

A great many people seem to miss their vocations because their bodies do not happen to fit their souls. This is one of the advantages of middle age; people have got used to their bodies and to their faults; they know how to use them, to spare them, and they do not expect too much.

"How funny to see so many books!" said Zoe, who was a very stupid girl (clever people generally make the same remarks as stupid ones, only they are in different words).

Let us do justice to the reluctant prayers that people offer up. They are not the less true because they are half-hearted, and because those who pray would sometimes gladly be spared an answer to their petitions.

"God bless you," he said, deserting his post with a prayer, as people do sometimes.

She had but little experience, and coldness of heart comes more often from ignorance than from want of kindness or will to sympathize. Sometimes the fire of adversity warms a cold heart, and then the story is not all sorrowful. The saddest story is that of some ice-bound souls whom the very fires of adversity cannot reach.

Thoughts seem occasionally to have a life of their own—a life independent—sometimes they are even stronger than the thinkers, and draw them relentlessly along. They seize hold of outward circumstances with their strong grip. How strangely a dominant thought sometimes runs through a whole epoch of life!

It was a dinner party just like any other. They are pretty festivals on the whole, though we affect to decry them. . . . It is fortunate, perhaps, that other people are not silent always because we are sad. With all its objections—I have read this in some other book—there is a bracing atmosphere in society, a Spartan-like determination to leave cares at home, and to try to forget all the ills and woes and rubs to which we are subject, and to think only of the present and the neighbours' fate has assigned for the time. Little by little, Dolly felt happier and more reassured. Where everything was so commonplace and unquestioning, it seemed as if tragedy could not exist. Comedies seem much more real at times than tragedy. Three or four tragedies befall us in the course of our existence, and a hundred daily comedies pass before our eyes.

Helpless as Philippa was, her helplessness always leant in the direction in which she wished to go; and in some mysterious fashion she seemed to get on as well as other stronger people. Some young officer in a complimentary copy of verses had once likened her to a lily. If so, it was a water-lily that she resembled most, with its beautiful pale head drifting on the water, while underneath was a long limp straggling stalk firmly rooted. Only those who had tried to influence her knew of its existence.

The story has, we think, suffered, as several of Miss Thackeray's stories have suffered, by being published in a magazine, and therefore, we may probably assume, written by fits and starts, and under some pressure. It is unequal; there are places where the writing becomes comparatively careless; and we can hardly doubt that by the expenditure of a little more pains the narrative might have been better bound together, and the figures set upon the canvas more clearly, instead of being allowed to drop in or turn up in a way which is apt to be confusing. But when we come to the individual characters, we have nothing but admiration for the skill, the grace, the delicacy, the subtle insight with which they are painted. The heroine, whose right it is to be first mentioned, is a very charming and lifelike conception—lifelike just because one perceives that there were points and sides in which she was not attractive, but perhaps a little repellent. She is not in the least like Maggie Tulliver in the *Mill on the Floss*; but the study of the development of her character from childhood into youth and womanhood, the preservation of its distinctive features under the changes which love and sorrow and the knowledge of good and evil bring with them, is one which deserves to be placed beside the similar study of Maggie's growth in that wonderful work of a wonderful genius. Next to its intense truthfulness, the keynote of Dolly's character is its imaginativeness, shown in a keen susceptibility to the influences of external nature. Few English writers, and perhaps no English novelists, have shown a more admirable power of describing what we may call the sentiment of nature—that fancied sympathy for human passion of sunshine and shadows, clouds, trees, and streams, which is the way in which poetical temperaments express the impression that all these things make on them in moments of high-strung feeling. It is indeed only such temperaments that experience such impressions, as it is only sensitive people that are strongly affected by the

* *Old Kensington*. By Miss Thackeray. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1873.

presence or the moods of other human beings whom they feel to be in some way either congenial or chilling; and one knows abundance of men, and women too, who, like Robert Henley in this story, set down a susceptibility to either class of influences as mere weakness or childishness or affectation. The latter form of susceptibility is no doubt far commoner than the former; but the former is so real and interesting where one meets it, that it deserves all the care and refined art which Miss Thackeray has (some may think too frequently) bestowed upon it here, and which has given occasion to some of her most charming sketches of scenery. The college garden at Cambridge, the evening scene on the Thames at Kingston, the description of St. Paul's Churchyard on the day when Henley and Dolly go to service in the Cathedral, are not only wonderfully vivid as pictures, but are skillfully used to bring out the contrast between the girl whose emotions were stirred in a way she did not understand by the beauty around her, and the obtuse energetic man to whom she had engaged herself in a sort of dream, and whom she then clothed with all the bright colours of her own fancy. Henley is perhaps the most finished and successful study of a prig in modern fiction; and he shows very forcibly what a terrible thing priggishness may be when it lies deep down in the soul, and is not, as sometimes happens, a mere affair of manner, the result of education or circumstances. The essence of his priggishness consists in a want of subtlety and insight, a fault which may be called as much intellectual as moral (to use the common division), but which poisons his whole nature. In many points of view he is a worthy person; he has good principles, a sense of duty, a firm will, a superiority to the more vulgar pleasures, a disposition to admire and be attracted by what is really beautiful, even a sort of unselfish capacity for affection. But he has no power of understanding a sensitive and impressionable nature like Dolly's; and just as little of knowing and judging himself. We do not mean to say that a man may not be both conceited and self-conscious, for conceit can take an infinity of shapes; but in Henley it is in great measure the want of self-consciousness that leaves him at the mercy of his conceit, and makes him the dupe and slave of a number of wooden formulas which he calls his principles. Most people are liable to mean thoughts and impulses; but self-conscious people, unfortunate as their condition is in other respects, have at least the advantage of knowing when these impulses are mean, and preventing them from taking effect in acts. This is what Henley wants; the absence of fine discernment makes him mistake bare selfishness for adherence to principle, and renders the sense of duty which he all the while possesses and fancies himself to be obeying, almost worse than useless.

The secondary characters are not less admirable, and even those who merely pass across the stage, like Squire Auley and Colonel Witherington, or whose voices are heard from behind the scenes, like Admiral Palmer, have a sharp individuality that witnesses to the wealth of dramatic faculty in the mind that produced them. Lady Sarah Francis is quite new to us; nor can anything be more delicate than the way in which her somewhat grim exterior, her suspiciousness, her habits of parsimony, are so touched as to increase, instead of weakening, the sympathy we feel for her. Philippa, the heroine's mother, might have been drawn by Mr. Thackeray himself; and it may be said (as somebody said of Mr. Wilberforce's one sarcastic speech) that it is the strongest proof of the authoress's kindness of nature that, possessing such a power of satire as she displays in this instance, she should so seldom exert it. The Morgan household are all very real, down to stupid, good-natured Zoe, with a happily suggested family likeness behind their contrasts; and the influence which bringing up in such a household would have upon the development of a character like Rhoda's is one of the most thoughtfully handled things in the book, though, as it is merely hinted at, the point might easily be missed. Rhoda herself we are not sure that we understand; but, seeing that there are some female characters which men never do understand, we dare say this is as it should be.

When we began writing, we meant to reproach Miss Thackeray with publishing her stories by instalments—a plan which, whatever it may be to the reader, is usually a disadvantage to the writer. But reading *Old Kensington* through a second time has given us so much pleasure that we don't wish to delay the beginning of another similar enjoyment a moment longer than is necessary. No work more clear and true and pure, more full of tenderness and grace, and of that insight which nothing but a keen sympathy with every phase of joy and sorrow can give, is produced among us than that by which she sustains the honours of her father's name.

SLAVE-CATCHING IN THE INDIAN OCEAN.

CAPTAIN COLOMB has written a book which contains much useful evidence as to the Eastern slave-trade, and which at the same time is really entertaining. Captain Colomb writes well, though he is perhaps a little too anxious to be facetious in the opening pages; he is a shrewd observer of men and things; and the views which he expresses, though not calculated for the palate of the general public, deserve a more serious answer than they are likely to receive. We will first describe his opportunities for observation, and then briefly consider his conclusions.

Captain Colomb was appointed to the command of the *Dryad* in 1868, with orders to take part in the suppression of the Eastern slave-trade. He was, as he tells us, in a state of mind not very

unusual with naval officers. He knew next to nothing as to the nature of the trade upon which he was to operate; and had to trust to picking up information on the scene of action. On the other hand, he had a code of elaborate regulations as to the mode of dealing with slave-dealers when caught, which, as we are rather led to infer, had been drawn up by officials not much better acquainted with the peculiarities of the trade than Captain Colomb himself. Besides this, he had for his further guidance, or his further perplexity, the text of a number of treaties between England and the various Powers which are more or less interested in the slave-trade. Captain Colomb was thus in the position familiar to British officers; he was to be at once energetic and strictly legal; if he was afraid of responsibility, he could not do his duty effectually; and if he did his duty effectually, he would very probably get into a scrape. He seems to have accepted his position in the best spirit, and, notwithstanding treaties and rules of international law, to have succeeded in inflicting a good deal of injury upon the slave-traders. The general nature of his operations on the principal scene of action is easily described. Lying in wait with his ship behind a headland of the Arabian coast, upon the summit of which a signal station had been erected, he was near the main stream of the slave-trading commerce. Whenever a "dhow" appeared, boats were in readiness to rush out upon the unsuspecting native, and, in case of need, the *Dryad* could get up steam and join in the chase. The dhow being captured, Captain Colomb proceeded to hold a court. Was the dhow engaged in the slave-trade or not? The instructions said that that question was to be answered by the presence or absence of certain symptoms, which had apparently been catalogued from the experience of the American slave-trade. As a matter of fact, the fatal signs—such, for example, as a number of shackles and handcuffs—were generally absent from the Arab slaver, whilst others were equally characteristic of the vessel engaged in legal trade. If, again, the dhow was condemned, the proper course was to forward her to a port of adjudication. The nearest port of adjudication was several hundred miles off, and the dhows are a kind of ship in which no English officer would trust a prize-crew. Thus, to obey the regulations literally would involve a very long absence from the station for the sake of condemning a single prize. Practically the course adopted was much simpler. One dhow, for example, contained a fat little nigger boy. If that boy were merely a domestic slave of the captain, his presence was unobjectionable. If he were an article of export, the dhow was a slaver. By the help of an Arab interpreter, a long cross-examination of the captain, the crew, and the nigger, led, after two days' discussion, to the conclusion that the boy had in fact been kidnapped at Zanzibar. The dhow was therefore sent to the bottom, and the crew allowed to find their own way home. As, in fact, all Arab traders have slaves with them, and the slaves are generally contented, or, at least, stolidly indifferent, it requires no little legal acuteness to discover whether the slaves are articles of merchandise or part of the legitimate crew. However, some rough and ready means of approximation to the truth was generally discovered; though it may be doubted whether the justice of the proceedings commended itself to the Arab mind. At length, however, Captain Colomb had the luck to come upon two or three genuine slavers, full of black articles of commerce to the brim. When the English flag appeared, they generally made straight for the shore; the dhow was destroyed in the surf, and as much as possible of the cargo was saved and marched off into the interior. Once away from the shore, English officers have of course no right to interfere with them. Captain Colomb's operations resulted in the release of 175 slaves in the course of a month's cruising. His description of their manners and customs when on board is graphic, if not complimentary. According to him, they were little better than dumb animals; accepting their change of fate with stolid indifference, and not showing the smallest sign of surprise at the novel sight of a man-of-war, or of the ponderous engines working close beside them. It does not appear that the slaves captured by Captain Colomb were suffering from ill-treatment. In the case of the largest capture which he made he describes the rescued cargo as consisting of "plump, well fed, healthy-looking negroes." Occasionally indeed there is great suffering; and crews of famished skeletons may be found crammed into an insufficient space. Captain Colomb, however, seems to be of opinion that, as a rule, the slaves and their masters fare pretty much alike, and that the sufferings are due rather to the want of foresight characteristic of the Arabs in general than to any cruelty in the traders.

And this brings us to Captain Colomb's conclusions upon the slave-trade in general. He does not, as will have been already inferred, take by any means an Exeter Hall view of the question. He entirely disbelieves in the pathetic black, forced from home and all its joys, and claiming to be a man and a brother. The black is, in his opinion, an apathetic and utterly stupid creature, who makes, on the whole, a decided advance in civilization by transportation to Arabia or Persia. Our notions of slavery are chiefly derived from the case of slaves said to have been worked to death on a West Indian plantation, in days when it was cheaper to import new hands than to grow them in the country. In the East domestic slavery is by no means degrading for the negro. Captain Colomb indeed admits that the Zanzibar slave-market is a disgusting sight; for it is disgusting to see men reduced to the level of cattle; but he witnessed none of the barbarities or indecencies said to be practised there. The word slavery, in fact, includes many different conditions. In Zanzibar there is no distinction in words between slavery and free service, and no difference in the modes of working and living between the

* *Slave-catching in the Indian Ocean*. By Captain Colomb, R.N. London: Longmans & Co. 1872.

two classes. The slave may compel a cruel master to sell him. He need only give five days' labour in a week. He can own property, and very frequently invests his little savings in purchasing other slaves. He cannot be sold, except in extreme cases of ill-conduct, or separated from his family. And all these regulations exist, not merely in theory, but in practice. Thus, according to Captain Colomb, slavery in this mitigated form is on the whole beneficial in the stage of social development actually in existence; and our abolitionists allow themselves to be excited by the name, without taking the trouble to examine into the circumstances which it implies. In short, Eastern slavery is not slavery in the Western sense. But, then, it will be asked, what do you say to the slave-trade? The unanimous opinion of all travellers is that the slave-trade is one of the main causes of demoralization amongst the negroes of the interior. Captain Colomb's reply deserves notice; but it must be added that this is the part of the case on which he speaks with the least authority. His own experience was necessarily limited to the coast, and he only argues about the interior slave-trade from sources open to everybody. He argues, however, with some vigour that the slave-trade has been made responsible for many evils which it does not really produce. The statements generally made as to the loss of life incurred in bringing caravans from the interior rest on most unsatisfactory evidence. The depopulation of the country attributed by Livingstone and others to the slave-trade is really due, as he seeks to prove from their own pages, to famines in bad seasons. The slave-trader is generally said to be hostile to more legitimate commerce. The real fact is that he combines both branches of trade. The same man deals in ivory or in slaves according to circumstances; and ivory is the most profitable of the two. The trader, therefore, would not encourage a war which would be fatal to the most productive part of his trading in order to stimulate the production of slaves. War, indeed, is produced as much by the legitimate variety of commerce as by its rival; for a native tribe will attack another to plunder it of its ivory as well as to steal its men.

The argument strikes us as very questionable when compared with the more direct accounts of the proceedings of slave-traders in the interior; and it would apparently lead to some rather startling conclusions. If slavery is really a mode of improving the African, if the slave-trade is desirable as a means of carrying commerce into the interior, then it would appear that we should rather encourage than exterminate the practice. Captain Colomb appears to think, indeed, that if we could hermetically seal the whole coast to the slave-traders, we should have conferred no benefit upon the tribes of the interior. They would continue to fight and to make slaves just as freely as before, and the only difference would be that the negroes would be spared a journey across the sea. He would be, if anything, more barbarously treated in making articles for export than if he were exported himself; and the net result of our operations would be as futile as most spasmodic benevolence. It would, however, be entirely unfair to represent this as Captain Colomb's last word on the subject. Undoubtedly he diverges from the ordinary view of the British abolitionist, but it is to take what, in his opinion, is a wider and not a less humane view of the subject. Slavery and the slave-trade, he says, are not the cause of all the evils of African society, but rather a symptom. Civilization there is at a low ebb, and slavery is a natural incident to civilization in that stage. Our treatment is defective because, whilst applying a vigorous corrective to the symptoms, we do not endeavour to eradicate the disease. Our burnings of dhows and emancipating of slaves—who are generally all the worse for our interference—rather hamper the trade, but they do not help to introduce a better state of things; both our victims the Arabs, and their victims the negroes, are utterly unable to appreciate our motives, and the only result is a slight alteration in the path of commerce. What, then, is to be done? If the British public would permit it, the right thing would be to form some English settlements on the East Coast, to treat the negroes there with the good vigorous discipline which has made the Kroomen really effective sailors on board of our men-of-war, and to raise up a generation capable of acting as missionaries of religion and of commerce amongst their own countrymen. The process would take some generations to carry out effectually; but in that way a real beginning might be made towards a genuine process of civilization. What is the chance that the British public will adopt Captain Colomb's view?

THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF RUSSIA.*

TIMES are indeed strangely altered since it was the fashion to repeat Napoleon's saying that Europe must become "Republican or Cossack," with a strong emphasis on the latter as the more probable alternative. The Crimean War, though its results are naturally depreciated by the party which would prefer peace at any price to the results of any war whatever, at least did the European world a marvellous service in helping nations to understand what was the true nature of the gigantic machine of despotism of which so many nations had stood in unreasonable awe. For then was it first made generally known that there is a vast difference between commanding the implicit obedience of

seventy millions of subjects distributed over a huge territory, and bringing their scattered forces into action at a definite point. It is true indeed that the Russian arms had come with a certain lustre out of the old war against Napoleon. Cathcart, the only English military writer on the great campaigns of 1813 who knew his subject scientifically, declared plainly that the soldiers of none of the many nations engaged bore the fatigues of marching with the same endurance and discipline as the Russians, and that their cavalry especially was a marvellous display of military power. On the other hand it should be remembered, when studying this subject critically, that the Russians of 1813 and 1814 enjoyed the special prestige justly due to their country for its successful defence against the conqueror of the rest of the Continent, and that diplomacy was deeply interested in magnifying both the strength and the exertions of the contingent which served under Alexander against Napoleon up to his first overthrow and abdication. The gratitude of nations too, though not very enduring, is by no means always an illusory notion; and we, whose military prowess stood justly high in the world's opinion at the time of that great event, need not be surprised at the admiration bestowed on the constant advance of the Russian standards from the ruins of Moscow to the walls of Paris.

Gratitude, however, may fade, while fear remains. More than forty years had passed by without the appearance of Russian soldiers in contest with any foe more civilized than the Turk. The world knew of their performances only from the constant records of successful struggles against the Mahometan nations that bordered their vast Empire on every side but the West; and so far as the history of these wars was heard, it was well calculated to maintain the reputation won by Russia in the second decade of the century, and to inspire the belief that her power was hardly less great for attack than for defence. Then came the sudden intervention of Prince Paskievitch with the garrison of Poland on the flank of the Hungarian contest. Görgey, and his comrades of the revolutionary armies, already outmatched in their contest with Austrian power, were willing to inflict a last humiliation on the sovereignty against which they had rebelled by at once laying down their arms to this new opponent, who had crossed the Hungarian frontier with his well-drilled and apparently resistless battalions. Bloodless and easy as the Russian triumph was, it had a singular effect in confirming the traditional belief in the military strength of the great Empire, which was thus able, as it were, to terminate her neighbour's difficulties by a mere demonstration. And thus it came about naturally that when England unexpectedly found herself forced, five years later, into a contest with the power so long spoken of as colossal, she entered on it, despite the vapouring of Mr. Cobden about the superior strength our commerce must give us, with a certain feeling of awe, as though engaged with an adversary furnished with military resources which no one could exactly pretend to measure.

The events of 1854-55 undid the world very thoroughly. The failures of Russia before the Danube fortresses—defended rather by the moral power of fanaticism well directed than by genuine material means—first shook her reputation. Then came the defeat of the Alma, a defeat suffered on her own chosen battlefield, boastfully occupied in full assurance of certain victory over the inexperienced invaders. When to this succeeded the long defence of Sebastopol, with its varying incidents of endurance on either side, the great fact shone out, that with all the courage to attempt, the Russian generals failed in the skill or power to make, a successful diversion. The check of Balaklava was followed by the bloody defeat of Inkermann, and the disastrous repulse at the Tchernaya; and the great leaguer slowly but steadily went on to its appointed end. Despite the genius and courage of the technical part of the defence, the huge fortress fell; and the very length of the resistance, with its despairing close by voluntary abandonment, proved conclusively to the world—to Russia no less than to other nations—that with the army open to succour, an entrenched line skilfully prepared and provided with the vastest material that fortress ever held, the defence had failed simply because the boasted strength of the Empire was so little capable of concentration, or of application to a particular point of its own frontier, that it was unable to maintain an equal front with forces brought from the most distant parts of Europe, better supported as they were from their far-off bases at Woolwich and Marseilles. The prestige of the Muscovite was effectually crushed. How much deeper would it have sunk had the world known what has but very recently been made public in the *Military Magazine* of St. Petersburg, that the wisest and oldest of the servants of the new Czar, the very same Paskievitch whose appearance in the Hungarian field six years before had so startled Europe, spent almost his last breath in adjuring his country to make peace whilst she had still one friend left in Prussia; for "I dread," he said in the plainest terms, "a new invasion of Russia by Europe conducted more prudently than that of Napoleon."

But if Russia was humbled by the events of 1855, the lesson of adversity was not lost on her rulers. From that time she has set herself steadily in the path of moral and material progress by which alone the whole means of great empires can be made subservient to the needs of war. Her people have been set free from serfdom. Her provinces are now bound together by the network of railways the want of which made her unable effectively to succour Prince Gortchakoff when overborne by the Allies. Her power has risen again steadily year by year, until we behold her once more reaching threateningly forward into Central Europe, at the very same time that she prepares to push

* *The Armed Strength of Russia.* Translated from the German at the Topographical Department of the War Office. 1873.

Die Heeresmacht Russlands. Berlin: Duncker.

her conquests into the heart of Asia. It is the strongest testimony to the revival of her power that the new Empire of Germany is making use of the millions wrested from France to throw a girdle of first-class fortresses along her eastern frontier; whilst the whole internal policy of Austria towards the motley population of trans-Leithania is guided by the desire of watching against the expected aggression from the side of Muscovy. Emperors may meet in brotherhood, and guards of honour may receive fraternal greetings; but the truth remains, as all know who see beneath the surface, that the soldier-caste of Germany are looking forward with scarcely disguised eagerness, and the politicians of Austria with ill-concealed dread, to the hour which shall see the national forces of one or both face to face with the legions of Russia. Not that the conditions of the struggle of 1807 and 1812 between West and East can be again repeated. For, whilst Russia has advanced, her neighbours have not stood still. And it ought never to be forgotten in any attempt to forecast the wars of the future, that those very appliances of civilization on which the advocates of peace once founded their faith, the boasted improvements in the art of communication which were to have bound mankind together in a brotherhood of nations, have proved not a whit less available for war than for commerce. Nay, comparing the results of recent history, it is by no means safe to assert that facilities for the aggrandizement of commerce have increased more rapidly since railroads and telegraphs covered the face of Europe than facilities for making war on a terrible and effective scale. One single main railroad through Poland and Lithuania would have strengthened Napoleon in 1812 more than a second half-million of soldiers. Doubtless some feeling that this was so weighed on the mind of Prince Paskievitch when, towards the close of the contest round Sebastopol, he gave the advice already mentioned. And it is very certain that no strategist worthy of the name would regard an attack on Russia as barred by the same difficulties which ruined alike Charles XII. and the mightier warrior who followed his footsteps towards Moscow with a greater force than monarch ever put into the field until armed Germany moved as one man to avenge his oppression on the inheritor of his name and Empire.

The problem of Russian strength has occupied many minds among the military students who abound in the councils of the great Continental military Powers. The Austrian War Office has devoted a special volume to it, recently translated by our own Topographical Department. And Prussia has a work of her own, published indeed anonymously, but attributed by general consent to the same able essayist who wrote for Count Moltke his History of the War of 1866. The former is a remarkably complete, though dry, account of the existing military organization of Russia; but it fails altogether to give any insight into the moral power which is to wield this, or to point out in any lively manner the peculiarities of breeding or discipline which have made the Russian serf in his half-emancipated state of soldier at times so formidable and enduring a combatant, at others so helpless a machine. Neither, indeed, does the Prussian writer of *Die Heeresmacht Russlands* enter philosophically into this matter. But he does put plainly before his readers the essential effects of the post-Crimean reforms on Russian organization, and the differences between the present military system and that of his own monarchy, as well as its improvements on that which existed under the Emperor Nicholas. The changes made since that great drill-master of the Muscovite serfs and terror of European diplomatists passed away, the victim of his own broken-down projects of aggrandizement, may be summarized shortly as follows.

Until a few years since the Russian forces consisted of two great sections, the Active army and the Reserve. The latter comprised the same description of passed soldiers as form the German Landwehr, and were not called out except for war. If war occurred, the reserve battalion of each regiment, which was maintained for the purpose, was designed suddenly to be enlarged to three, corresponding nearly to the three active battalions kept up normally in the regiment. These additional battalions were to be filled up with reserve men, and officered by transfers from the others, with a large supplement of new commissions. It is speaking mildly of such a system to say, with the Prussian writer, that mobilization under these conditions would amount to "a general upsetting of all proper conditions of command." The theory was no doubt effectually settled by the events of 1855. Since that time the so-called Reserve Army has disappeared from the Russian organization; the number of active divisions has been largely increased; and although (as we may add on our own authority) a number of trained soldiers are constantly kept for economy's sake on furlough, the cadres of the real forces are immensely augmented. The paper total is indeed less than that of ante-Crimean days, when the so-called Reserve of 290,000 men, if ever embodied, being added to the Active force of 360,000, would have given an effective of 650,000, as against the 584,000 now on the rolls. But the latter the Prussian writer believes to be vastly more efficient for any warlike purpose, and we have no doubt that this view is correct. Both these statements exclude immense rolls of non-combatants, as well as the numerous local corps maintained exclusively for garrison or training objects, and not available for the field. These, if added, would swell the Russian army to nearly the million at which it has been popularly estimated.

Of the organization by which the military mass is controlled, and the peculiar characteristics of this, as compared with that of Germany, no space remains to us to speak to-day. For the same reason we must reserve all mention of the reforms recently proposed

by the Commission, and understood to be adopted in the Imperial Council, though so strongly opposed by the Minister, General Miliutin, as to threaten, according to latest reports, his actual resignation of his charge.

LA FEMME DE CLAUDE.*

IN London, less theatrical than Paris, when a play has failed, it soon glides out of the memory, and no more is heard about it. Such is not the case in the French capital. There, if the dramatist whose work has proved unfortunate has attained a certain degree of eminence, and more especially if he is held to represent some shade of public opinion, he has a chance of getting more fame by failure than by success, and may fairly say, like Mawworm, without a tinge of hypocrisy, that he likes to be persecuted. His play, withdrawn from the boards, is nevertheless published, and its publication provides him with an opportunity for adorning it with an elaborate preface, in which he can attack his foes and propound his theories, with a full assurance that the book will be extensively read. In some cases, of the two parts of which the book is composed, the preface and the play, the former is the more attractive; and we are inclined to suspect that among the students of French manners who have invested four francs in the purchase of the very goodly volume which contains the last dramatic emanation from the brain of M. Alexandre Dumas fils, the majority of those who go steadily through *La Femme de Claude* are stimulated so to do less by the pleasure derived from the play itself than by a desire to obtain the proper standpoint for the enjoyment of the preface.

La Femme de Claude, announced long before, was ultimately brought out at the Gymnase in the middle of January last. The event was anticipated with an eagerness to which, where the drama is concerned, nothing in England can be compared; the excitement that is invariably caused in Paris by a *première représentation* having been heightened in this particular case by the knowledge that the play would illustrate the doctrine already preached by its author in the pamphlet *L'Homme-Femme*, which had been published in the previous summer, and had made a noise such as no writer of essays on social science can hope to produce who does not wield his pen with the verve and utter freedom from restraint which pertain to the younger Dumas. Even those courageous ladies for whom it is a pleasant recreation to study the details of Contagious Disease might light upon pages in *L'Homme-Femme* which they would consider rather strong.

The purport of the book, as many of our readers will remember, is however sternly moral, to a degree that would have won the applause of an old Puritan governor of New England. With such horror does M. Dumas regard female frailty that, in his opinion, a worthy man wedded to a woman who has deceived him, and who cannot possibly be recalled to the path of virtue, has only one course to pursue. This course is indicated in the counsel he would give to his son, if he were fortunate enough to have one. Speaking of the incorrigible lady, he says:—

Ce n'est pas la femme, ce n'est pas même une femme; elle n'est pas dans la conception divine, elle est purement animale; c'est la guenon du pays de Nod, c'est la femelle de Caïn; tue-la.

Since last June the concluding words of the above passage have almost become a party cry, and if we regarded the remarks made in some of the Parisian journals as a fair index of French opinion, we should be forced to believe that the question, how a faithless wife ought to be treated, lately divided society into two hostile camps—one headed by M. Dumas, with the terrible "Tue-la" on his banner, the other by M. Émile de Girardin and M. H. d'Ideville, who preached the duty of pardon. It is no mere supposition that the coming *Femme de Claude* was intended to illustrate the doctrine of *L'Homme-Femme*, the author having made in the second page of his pamphlet a declaration to that effect. The French public fully knew what they had a right to anticipate:—

Il va sans dire [says M. Dumas in the pamphlet] qu'il s'agit d'un Claude moderne, conscient, chrétien, et non du Claude historique et imbécile qui fait ou plutôt qui laisse tuer sa femme par Narcisse. Quant à la femme, c'est l'éternelle Messaline, après comme avant le Christ.

By some of the French journals great pains were taken to describe the aspect of the *salle* of the Gymnase on the 16th of last January. The two opposite opinions on the grand theme were fully represented, and the angels of justice and of mercy were both present in the shape of M. Alexandre Dumas and M. Émile de Girardin.

With all possible brevity we perform the necessary task of giving some notion of the plot of *La Femme de Claude*. The action of the piece is supposed to take place in one of the French provinces since the termination of the late war. Claude Ruper, disappointed in his hopes of domestic happiness, in consequence of the utter wickedness of his wife Césarine, who indulges in the two opposite bad habits of eloping with some newly found lover and coming back when least wanted, has devoted all his energies to the invention of an extraordinary cannon, which will enable its owner to destroy any foes, however great their numerical superiority, and may consequently lead to the resuscitation of his country. His companions are Antonin, a young friend, who is a partner in his studies, and shows his proficiency by the minor invention of a double-barrelled musket, which can however do extraordinary things; an old Jew, named Daniel, whose

* *La Femme de Claude*, pièce en trois actes, précédée d'une préface. Par Alexandre Dumas fils. Paris: Lévy Frères. 1873.

sole object it is to discover the eleven lost tribes of *Ephraïm* (sic): and Daniel's daughter Rachel, a somewhat dreamy young lady, who worships him with that sort of love which people are accustomed to call platonic. At the commencement of the play *Césarine* unexpectedly makes her appearance at Claude's abode, having lived several weeks with a lover, under the pretext of a visit to her grandmother, with the full determination of obtaining a pardon from her husband, who, taught by a long and bitter experience that her life is one uninterrupted course of evil, has ceased to regard her even with indignation; and who, discovering that his friend and pupil Antonin is smitten by her indubitable charms, contents himself with warning the youth in the kindest manner not to waste his affections on a creature so miserably worthless. Another visitor is M. Cantagnac, ostensibly a retired notary, who talks with the accent proper to Marseilles, and has been attracted to the house by an advertisement, in which Claude, hard pressed for money in consequence of his devotion to work hitherto unprofitable, has offered his landed estate for sale. He has heard of the cannon, and would rather advance a large sum, on the understanding that he is to receive one-fourth of the profits that may result from the invention, than purchase Claude's estate. The offer is refused, as Claude will have no partner in his glory, and the offer of sale being renewed, M. Cantagnac is left to talk business with Madame Rupel, whose consent to the operation is legally necessary. No sooner is the supposed notary left alone with *Césarine* than he drops his southern accent, and, without any attempt at circumlocution, bluntly asks her what price she will take to betray the secret of her husband's invention. He is the agent of an anonymous society, with an unlimited capital, which by purchasing the ideas of others resolves to become master of the world, and Claude's cannon is just one of the articles which the society would like to possess. As *Césarine* does not jump at the offer of money, Cantagnac explains that refusal on her part will be dangerous; and he calmly recounts to her all the infamy of her past life, including the birth of a child before her marriage with Claude. The implied threat of exposure she meets with a smile, informing her kind biographer that her husband already knows and has condoned all the facts he has enumerated; but presently he comes to a fact which Claude does not know—namely, to a dark deed perpetrated on a certain 1st of September, which seems to have been the destruction before birth of a lawful child, and, as Macheath would say, her courage is out. She is in the power of Cantagnac, and she will do all she can to betray her husband, it being understood, however, that in the event of her success she will receive some little remuneration, not as yet defined.

The second act makes us acquainted with those mysterious persons the Jew Daniel and his daughter, who, as the former assures us, are about to set out on a voyage which may possibly comprise China, the Salt Lake, and the Desert of Sahara; the zeal of the old gentleman in looking out for the lost tribes not being accompanied by the slightest notion of their whereabouts. Rebecca's motive for accompanying her father is clearly her anxiety to leave the house of the man she dreamily loves now that his wife has returned. The Parisian public do not seem to have exactly understood the utility of this Hebrew maiden, but to have regarded her somewhat as a bore. They will know better now that the preface is published. She serves to impress upon the mind one great defect in the matrimonial law of France. If good Claude could have obtained a divorce, he might have taken amiable Rebecca for a wife in the place of abominable *Césarine*; but now the union must be deferred until the two pure souls shall meet after death in the region of bliss. In the meanwhile *Césarine*, feeling no kind of repentance, vainly seeks to obtain a reconciliation with her imperturbable husband, who is not moved till she darkly hints that his obstinacy may cause the sacrifice of those whom he loves. He now tells her that, where she only is concerned, she may do whatever she likes, but that if she interferes with his invention, which is to benefit humanity in general and France in particular, or with any of his private friends, he will certainly kill her. It is especially Antonin that he has in view; for he knows, as we have said, that this young man is smitten. The value of the youth, in the eyes of *Césarine*, is simply this—that he keeps the key of the coffer in which Claude's plans are contained.

The whole action of the piece is comprised within the limit of a single day. Claude has promised to accompany his Hebrew friends to the nearest station, and during his absence his coffer is to be ransacked by *Césarine* in the interest of Cantagnac. *Césarine* has secretly entrusted Antonin with a round sum of money, the gift of another admirer, and it is deposited by him in the coffer for safe custody. When he is left alone with the designing lady, he reluctantly consents to elope with her, and, as ready cash is required for that, opens the lid of the box. She takes immediate advantage of her opportunity to seize on Claude's papers, and would throw them from the window to Cantagnac, who is waiting outside. In this deed of villany, however, Antonin will not be a partner, but, struggling desperately with *Césarine*, he endeavours to obtain the restitution of the papers, when the contest and the piece are suddenly brought to an end by Claude, who, warned by a female servant, unexpectedly appears, and, crying "Voleuse!" shoots his wife dead with Antonin's musket. Antonin is fully prepared to receive the contents of the other barrel; but Claude simply throws down the weapon, and kindly says, "Et toi, viens travailler"; whereupon the youth kneels to his benefactor as the curtain falls.

The play did not greatly please, and its run at the Gymnase was not of long duration, bringing more repute to Madlle. Desclée, who represented *Césarine*, than to M. Alexandre Dumas. But, if its own life was not merry as well as short, it was a fruitful cause of merriment in others; and seldom has a more diverting *jeu d'esprit* appeared in *Le Figaro* than the report of Claude's trial for the death of his wife, at which all the *dramatis personæ* appeared as witnesses, and which resulted in the condemnation of Claude, though his punishment was made exceedingly light on the ground of unquestionably extenuating circumstances.

The various attacks upon *Claude*, viewed in relation to *L'Homme-Femme*, were based on two distinct kinds. On the one hand it was contended that a gentleman who shot his wife, not as an adulteress, but as a "voleuse," did not in any way illustrate the practical force of the precept "Tue-la" as laid down in the pamphlet. On the other hand it was asserted that "Tue-la" itself was a mischievous mandate, and that zeal for the seventh commandment need not lead to the recommendation of an infraction of the sixth. There are laws against murder, and those laws ought to be respected. Foremost among the assailants of *Claude* was M. Cuvillier-Fleury, of the *Journal des Débats*, who is likewise a member of the Academy, and the letter written to him by M. Dumas constitutes the preface to the printed drama. One of the passages in the article to which the letter refers is certainly somewhat strong. Not content with forbidding (the expression is "Je vous défends de la tuer") M. Dumas to kill an erring wife, he thus questions his right to step forth as a moral teacher:—

A-t-il une longue expérience de la morale qu'il professe? A-t-il fait l'épreuve sérieuse des leçons qu'il donne? A-t-il droit au crédit dans l'ordre philosophique, le crédit du prédicateur public, du législateur à mandat, du magistrat sur son siège, de tous ceux en un mot qui ont reçu de la société mission de l'éduquer, de régler sa vie et d'apprécier ses actes? A-t-il ou a-t-il non un tel crédit?

These questions, which, to say the least of them, are not very discreet, inasmuch as they imply a denial of the right of everybody who does not belong to certain privileged sections of the community to express an opinion on any social subject whatever, M. Dumas very properly answers in the negative, adding that if he is without a right he means to take one, and giving his reason why:—

Pourquoi? Je vais vous le dire. Parce que, comme dit tout bonnement le proverbe, l'habit ne fait pas le moine. Il ne s'agit donc pas d'avoir reçu de la société mission de faire tels ou tels actes; ce n'est qu'une fonction cela; il s'agit d'avoir reçu de sa conscience ordre de faire telle ou telle action.

Referring to the case of Voltaire and Calas, he adds:—

Ce jour-là, ce sont les juges et les prêtres qui ont été des imbéciles, ou des misérables; c'est l'homme de lettres, sans mandat et sans siège, qui a fait fonction effective de prêtre et de juge.

At the onset M. Dumas certainly has the best of it; he is no doubt right when he asserts that his adversary, as the champion of law as it stands, is merely advocating a human institution, the value of which every one has a right to discuss; and when, unhappily, M. Cuvillier-Fleury assigns to La Fontaine a quotation which belongs to Voltaire, the little slip, though it has nothing to do with the main argument, affords M. Dumas an opportunity of correcting the mistake, and thus putting the foe, in his Academical capacity, in a somewhat funny position.

These are but trifles. The challenge of M. Cuvillier-Fleury elicits from M. Dumas a discourse of the most varied character, including an autobiography of his early youth, when he was the boon companion of his father, saw a great deal of "fast" life, and mingled in very questionable female society. He studied love as the chief agent in society, and as love generally is the leading motive in a modern drama, he thought the theatre was the place most fitted to his teachings. An exceedingly droll description of the plot of Corneille's *Cid*, too long to cite here, illustrates the predominance of love upon the stage, holding up the adored Chimène to universal execration. M. Dumas complains, not without reason, that, however he treats his pet subject, nobody is satisfied. When, in his *Dame aux Camélias*, he preached pardon to a Magdalen, he was accused of rehabilitating courtesans; now that he refuses pardon to *Césarine*, he is looked upon as the advocate of murder. No wonder that he considers himself hardly used.

In the case before us he cannot be accused of erring on the side of mercy, and he seems to have been urged to take up his present strong position by an Apocalyptic vision. He saw a Beast, with seven heads, clad in purple and scarlet, thus combining in one the two figures described by St. John in the Revelation (c. xvii.), and devouring all sorts of miserable victims:—

Au-dessus de chacun des sept diadèmes, au milieu de toutes sortes de mots de blasphème, flamboyait ce mot, plus gros que tous les autres: Prostitution. Or cette Bête n'était autre qu'une incarnation nouvelle de la femme, décidée de faire sa révolution à son tour. Après des millions d'années d'esclavage et d'impuissance, malgré les légendes du théâtre, cette victime de l'honneur avait voulu avoir raison de lui, et croyant briser les liens de l'esclavage en brisant ceux de la pudeur, elle s'était dressée tout à coup, armée de toutes ses beautés, de toutes ses ruses, de toutes ses faiblesses apparentes.

This Beast, the incarnation of "social evil," became particularly mischievous in France after the termination of the last war. Finding the country in a very disorderly condition, perceiving the people more ignorant, more divided, more enfeebled than ever, and regaled by the smell of powder, the roar of cannon, the miasma of death, she gathered new courage; and just when the Frenchman ought to have been most serious, she told him that, having behaved well and suffered much, he now ought to abandon himself to pleasure, of which she is the representative. The poor Frenchman hesitated,

and pointed to a wall on which the German had chalked the words, "Cinq milliards de dettes." This difficulty was solved at once. The Beast showed him a Hebrew capitalist, who on another wall chalked up, "Quarante-deux milliards de crédit." France was richer and better off than at any period of her life; and the fools, whose number, according to the statistics of M. Dumas, may be valued as equal to nine-tenths of the population, resolved to make up for lost time. So they worshipped the Beast with renewed vigour, and some of them married her.

The Beast, if we may trust M. Dumas, had a powerful ally, a man of iron will, who dwelt on the other side of the Rhine, and who, watching her triumph with pleasure, rubbed his hands, and said to his nominal master, "Your Majesty may now look towards the East; there is nothing more to fear from the West; *on y meurt*." Things having gone thus far, M. Dumas thought the time had arrived when the Beast ought to be killed; and Claude, who, in spite of his unlucky marriage, belonged to the best tenth of the population, was appointed to show the best way in which the difficult operation might be performed. In brief, Claude is France, Césarine is the Beast, and Cantagnac is—who M. Dumas will not precisely say. His insinuated explanation is given in his own words:—

Pourquoi ne t'ai-je pas dit tout de suite à quelle nation appartient cet homme (Cantagnac), c'était bien plus simple, au théâtre surtout, où l'on n'a pas de temps à perdre? Parce que je ne pouvais pas le dire. Tu ne sais donc pas que nous sommes abaissés et déchus à ce point que nos actes eux-mêmes sont sous la censure de cet anonyme que tu n'as pas reconnu et dont tu devrais toujours sentir l'odeur dans l'air que tu respirez. Tu ne te rappelles donc pas que l'an dernier, il nous a fallu retirer de notre exposition de peintures, avant même qu'elle fût ouverte, deux tableaux qui auraient pu lui déplaire, et, s'il y eût eu dans ma pièce le moindre mot que le désignât positivement, il aurait exigé de nos gouvernants apparens qu'ils défendissent la représentation de cette pièce.

It seems then that the enemies of the dramatist did not know what they were attacking. While they thought Claude was a very cruel man to kill his wife, they little suspected that the object of M. Dumas was to inspire the Gaul with a patriotic hatred of the Teuton.

NEWMARKET AND ARABIA.*

WE are somewhat provoked with this book. It contains, no doubt, a good deal of truth; it comes just at the time when some such book is needed, and it abounds with valuable suggestions; but it is so one-sided in its views, and so overloaded with exaggerations on behalf of a favourite theory, that it will probably do more harm than good.

There is a story told of some apathetic guest at Eaton who drove Lord Westminster's stud-groom into a frenzy of astonishment and disgust. When the immortal Touchstone was paraded for inspection, he listlessly asked, "Is he thoroughbred?" This question, had it come from Captain Upton, so far from being a slight, must have been looked upon as the highest compliment he could pay, seeing that, according to him, no thoroughbred horse exists now, or ever has existed, among our English racers; hence the bare possibilities implied in such an inquiry would at once have set Touchstone in a class by himself. But even that ambiguous compliment would not have been offered. For Captain Upton there is but one thoroughbred horse in the world, his unchanged and unchangeable Arab; any small portion of good blood to be found here is owing, almost entirely, to a single imported stallion, the well-known Darley Arabian. Now we ourselves are rather fanatics in the same direction; but our fanaticism, measured against his, is as a Sabbath day's journey compared with a voyage round the world. We are ready to believe a good deal in favour of the old English studs, and their Desert forefathers; but Captain Upton's creed is quite beyond us. For instance, we do not believe that, when the Ark grounded on Ararat, seven perfect Arabs stepped gracefully down over the dripping rocks, and made their way at once to Yemen. We do not realize the fact that Peleg and Joktan rode about the Wilderness on progenitors of the Darley Arabian. Nor do we think it discreet to twist Scripture into a catena of whimsical proofs all tending to show that the said Darley Arabian is in every respect superior to the Byerley Turk or the Godolphin Barb. Our opinion is a very different one. We look upon the word "thoroughbred" as merely a conventional term, and are satisfied that, if our running horses are not thoroughbred, neither, according to Captain Upton's ideal interpretation of the phrase, are the high-blooded coursers of the great Anezzah itself. From the naturalist's point of view we do not mean to dogmatize. Still, if our author were to ask Professor Owen or Professor Huxley whether a breed of horses consisting of bays, browns, chestnuts, blacks, greys, and whites, is more likely to be a primeval and homogeneous, or a composite and manufactured, race, we think we know what answer he would get. In the second place, looking at history, the first high-bred horses we meet with were not Arabs, but White Cilicians.

Whether the white variety, common enough in Arabia, may not inherit some of their blood, is, we think, a fair question, though we cannot answer it. So superior were they to all the other breeds then known, that they were accepted from that province by the Persian monarchs in lieu of all other tribute. It was out of their number that the sacred horses were selected

to draw the chariot of the Sun. It was of them that Herodotus speaks when he describes the earliest recorded international race, and says, *ai di epáristai tōn θερράων ἰκίοντο πολὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Μήδων*—a statement which our modern Turf reporters would probably paraphrase somewhat after this fashion:—"The representatives of the Persian stable made strong running from end to end, and polished off the cracks of Thessaly before they had accomplished half the distance." Now at this time all the available resources of that vast empire were swept together, as by some huge drag-net, into one place. No production, even of the remotest and most barbarous region, likely to be of use in the campaign, was left uncalled for or unexact by the Great King. Still, Peleg and Joktan notwithstanding, the Arab contingent of Xerxes's army brought no horses into the field, but came mounted upon camels. What was the end of these White Cilicians? Could any remnants of the old stock be hunted up now? Were they ever known to and valued by the Romans? We rather fancy not. Cicero, proconsul there once, and a very sulky proconsul too, was not lucky enough to be born in Yorkshire. Had he been, he would have made it his business, and his pleasure also, to find out all about them. Unfortunately for us, however, instead of attending to really important matters, he would think and talk about nothing but himself and the ephemeral politics of Rome. Besides this, he knew nothing about action, except indeed that inferior branch of it which is connected with the Forum only, and not with the Turf. Mr. Disraeli, indeed, in one of his novels (the wondrous tale of *Alroy*, if we are not mistaken) affirms that the finest horse in the world is not the Arab, but the White Anatolian; where he fell in with these splendid animals he does not say—we suppose in the peerless stables of his friend Sidonia. If so, what a point he missed in *Coningsby*! How grandly it would have sounded if, after Sidonia's victory, he had chosen to reply, when asked about the pedigree of his mare, "Daughter of the Star":—"No, she is not an Arab, she is a White Cilician, one of the last descendants of that once Imperial race. The founders of that subdivision of our hereditary stud were presented to my ancestor by Artaxerxes Mnemon for lending him a million of staters (he happened luckily to have them about him) under circumstances of some delicacy, and that too when all the other Persian capitalists pleaded poverty, having a notion that the Royal recollection, so wonderful in other respects, just fell short of infallibility where such trifling personal debts were concerned." However this may be, we hope that the Committee now sitting will have Mr. Disraeli before them, to tell us all he knows about these White Anatolians; for, setting Cilicians aside, we have a long-standing prejudice in favour of our White Turks—Place's White Turk, the D'Arcy White Turk, and so on. We are sorry to lose entirely the white and grey horses that once, in very early times, constituted the majority of our runners; they are now altogether obliterated from the stud-book. And yet, unless we deceive ourselves, they often showed a stoutness and endurance peculiar to themselves and well worth preserving.

We fear that Captain Upton will hardly believe his eyes when he finds our opinion to be that not only the above-named White Cilicians, but also the North African horses, or Barbs, came of a more ancient stock than their Arabian cousins. The frequent victories obtained at the Olympic games by the rulers of Cyrene were owing, we fancy, to the superior stamina of their Barbs, matched as they were against half-bred animals from Laconia and Thessaly. When Sophocles invents a race, and an accident in it (something of the kind had probably happened shortly before), to account for the imaginary death of Orestes, the Libyan coursers of Cyrene are in front till the disaster happens. At any rate, for some of the finest odes of Pindar, notably for the Fourth Pythian, we are indebted to the Barbary horse. This Barbary horse, long after Pindar, long after Hannibal and Massinissa—with their impetuous onsets of Numidian cavalry—seems to have maintained his reputation. In a note on Lucian's Dialogue "Nigrinus" there is introduced a curious document, referring perhaps to the Hippodrome of Constantinople; we will, at any rate, assume it to do so. It seems imperfect; and Gronovius, who cites it from Jacobus Sponius, a learned antiquary of the seventeenth century, does not (it was unnecessary for his purpose that he should) enter into any explanations, nor does he give any date. In it, however, as far as we can make out, a certain Calidus, who was, like Hannibal, "a very pretty fellow in his day" and, we will not doubt, an honest and a distinguished member of the Golden Horn Jockey Club, preserves for the benefit of posterity a correct card of all his winning horses. Now a large majority of these are marked off as Africans; occasionally a Spanish, a Thessalian, a Gallic runner, interrupts the long catalogue of Barbs. It is, however, but occasionally. Africans, Africans, Africans—Cyrenæans, and so forth—almost monopolize the list; and, what is remarkable, not a single Arab is to be found in a head-roll of seventy-one names. We admit that by itself this negative evidence is scarcely conclusive: yet surely, as far as it goes, it tends to fortify the arguments and support the opinions of those who, like Youatt, maintain on other grounds that the horse is not indigenous in Arabia, but of comparatively recent introduction. The modern Turfite may perhaps like to know what designations obtained in the stud of his Roman predecessors, and thus to reproduce before his imagination the bellowing of the Constantinople Palmers when they offered (as no doubt they would offer, even if the last Paleologus were arming himself in despair for his last battle, and the barbarians thundering at their gates) to lay 100 to 40 "agen anything" bar

* *Newmarket and Arabia: an Examination of the Descent of Racers and Coursers.* By Roger D. Upton, Captain late 9th Royal Lancers. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1873.

one. The old Patrician—whether he be of the green faction or the blue—names his horses well. Advola (the Flyer-in), an African; Sagittarius (the Archer), an African; Æther, an African; Pugio (Poniard), an African; Sica (Dagger), an African, are among the most conspicuous performers. The first three of these names seem more appropriate to speed, the last two, Dagger and Poniard, suggest a pun—but our better angel intervenes, and we blot it out. Under the blot, however, the word “Stickers” is still just visible, and there we leave it. Speaking seriously, however, we suppose it would be admitted generally that the true Arab, whatever his origin, is now, upon the whole, superior to the Barbs. And it is with horses of the nineteenth century that we have to deal, not with horses of the Book of Genesis. It is, therefore, to be wished that men like Captain Upton, who know a great deal about this matter, and whose opinions deserve respect, should confine their enthusiasm within reasonable limits. It is, *pace* Captain Upton, beyond all question that our English breed of running horses is the fastest in the world. No Arab ever seen in England can compete (for a single race or so we mean) with a good specimen of the English racehorse, notwithstanding that an immense amount of weight is, or was, conceded to him; but whether he is not superior to his European kinsman in endurance, in constitutional power, in soundness, in the ability to work on without giving way through hunger and thirst, and in a vigour kept up to extreme old age, is quite another matter. We think that a rule *nisi* should be granted against Favonius, Cremorne, and the other horses in possession, upon these points. Nor, as far as practical measures are concerned, is there much difference of opinion between Captain Upton and ourselves. Having but little confidence either in the Government or the Jockey Club, we would fain hope that some of our great landed proprietors may take the matter into their own hands, and give the experiment of breeding from pure Arabs a full and fair trial. They must, however, turn their backs resolutely on the existing Turf, forego all hopes of immediate gain, and race, if race they must, among themselves, for nominal prizes and marks of honour—for a wreath of wild olive, so to speak, such as Hiero and Arcesilaus sent their horses across the sea to contend for without counting the cost. They must also give their minds and their money towards procuring the finest and most genuine specimens of the breed; and this, we believe, is not impossible. The superstition of the Arabs against unlucky marks which have nothing to do with the real merits of the horse may stand their friend, even if the Bedouins decline to sell their own favourites in open markets.

We would, however, go further than Captain Upton. There are many other breeds of horses besides his darling Arab breed whose qualities we should like to see settled by careful experiment. Notably there are the breeds of Turkestan, so famous for the iron hardness of their hoofs and feet; the horses of Dongola, if they still exist, as described by Bruce; an almost unknown breed, differing from the Arab, and yet apparently of high blood, that is found in Soudan; a chestnut variety of the Persian horse, greatly esteemed by the Russians; and so on. Such experiments, in a few years, would settle once for all whether it will be better to confine ourselves to a single breed because, upon the whole, it is the best, or whether we should not also encourage a mixed race, in the hope of securing special advantages and avoiding special defects. For we need hardly tell Captain Upton that his extreme enthusiasm about the shape and make of the Arab is by no means universal. Many good judges of a horse declare that he is low before, not sure-footed, and with a shoulder almost always heavy, upright, and bad. Captain Upton would probably reply that they have never seen a true Arab, and know nothing about the matter. *Non nostrum est tantas componere lites*. We have dealt thus far with only one half of Captain Upton's subject, but we hope to return to his work on a future occasion.

CYLLENE.*

MR. SNEYD deserves credit for the not inconsiderable labour which he must have devoted to the production of this book. It would be an exaggeration to say that the labour has been entirely successful; but it is no exaggeration to say that there is nothing in these pages which the author need be ashamed of, though it may be that some years hence he will find that, when he proposed to himself to construct an English novel founded on “the victorious march of the Emperor Constantine, the battle of the Milvian Bridge, the fall of Paganism, and the establishment of Christianity as the State religion of Rome,” he attempted a task beyond not only his, but almost any living writer's, powers. The late Lord Lytton, in the fulness of his strength, made an effort in the *Last Days of Pompeii* to reproduce the life of eighteen hundred years ago; and in the recently published drama of *Hannibal* a scholar of eminence has, with considerable vigour, attempted to breathe life into the dry bones of one of the most dramatic episodes in Roman history. But it may be questioned if either of these authors has really succeeded. Innumerable readers, no doubt, have yielded to the fascination of Lord Lytton's writing, and have followed in imagination the varying fortunes of Glaucus and Ione, the development of the story of the blind girl Nydia, the hideous life and death of Arbaces the priest of Isis; and they have been carried away by the dramatic skill with which the author has described one of the most terrible physical catastrophes known to

history. But most scholars have condemned the book; and, not perhaps unjustly, have sneered at the superficial treatment of subjects dear to them, and with which they are as familiar as with events going on around them at the present day. On the other hand, a few scholars have read with interest and have commended Mr. Nichol's poem, admitting its rigid adherence to the classical type, its scholarlike excellence, and the careful rendering of the character of the great Carthaginian. But the poem has taken no hold of the popular imagination. Mr. Trollope's most commonplace novel has probably been read by more than double the number of people who have even heard of Mr. Nichol's *Hannibal*. And this is the difficulty which any author has to meet who tries to reproduce in fiction the life of classical times. If he is popular, scholars will condemn him; and if he is admired by the scholar world, he will fail to be popular. Antagonism between the learned and the popular ear is almost inevitable. If you speak to the initiated, the uninitiated do not understand you, and will not take the trouble to make you out; and if you speak to the latter, the former will call you Philistine, and will pass you by with careless contempt.

Mr. Sneyd cannot, we fear, be congratulated on having steered his course successfully between these two opposing forces. It may be that he has fallen a victim to both. Looked at critically, the book will please neither one side nor the other. It is too much of an historical prize essay to satisfy the public, and too much of a sentimental nineteenth-century love story to satisfy the scholars. Young ladies will shrink from the historical details of the symposium at Baie, and the horrors of the Flavian Amphitheatre. Young gentlemen will think the style Johnsonian, and the tone monotonous. They will prefer to read history, if they read it at all, in Gibbon. His epigrams are more amusing than Mr. Sneyd's very best writing. The obscure Latin of his notes is more enticing and not less accurate than the dogmatic English of Mr. Sneyd's. And there is a fine sense of doing something to improve yourself attaching to a real book of history which can never attach to the pages of a novel. Scholars, on the other hand, will pick holes in the classical allusions and explanations and in the historical grouping (and they will find no great difficulty in doing either), and they will characterize the book as both inaccurate and undignified. And both sides will come away with the idea that they have been reading “cram,” and probably they will not be far wrong in such a supposition. The author must have spent many days in compiling all the information which he has brought together in these pages. “I have,” he says, “in every instance drawn my inspirations from the fountain-head, especially from the colloquial Latin writers, the post-Augustan classics, the panegyrist, and ecclesiastical historians.” Perhaps he might have spent his time more profitably. He could not well have spent it more conscientiously. Such assiduity in the compilation of a two-volume novel ought to have its reward. And perhaps the pleasure of living in imagination with Cyllene, and Cethegus, and Claudian, and the faithful Alcon, and of attempting to people again the wooded shores of Surrentum, or the villa at Aricia, or the town house at Rome with the darlings of his imagination, may have been a reward sufficient for the author, and he will be comparatively careless of the effect which his work will have. He is probably young, as this is his first work, and he will not consider the time as wasted. Ninety-nine men out of a hundred who rush abroad after taking their degrees and spend months in Italy, and months in Egypt, or it may be, further away from home, come back again with nothing but vague impressions of having been a long way from England, of having seen and done a great many things the recollections of which are fitting about confusedly in their minds, and of having generally enjoyed themselves. Mr. Sneyd has probably got all that, and a great deal more. If he has not done much good by writing this book, he certainly has done no harm. And if, as we suppose, he has really enjoyed the writing of it, he may have the full benefit of the reflection that, if he might have done more with his time than he has done, ninety-nine men out of a hundred under similar conditions would have done much less.

The outline of the story is simple, but the filling in is, not to use a stronger expression, intricate. Cyllene, the beautiful daughter of Cethegus—a well drawn type of the Roman stoic of the post-Augustan age, consistent in his life and his self-inflicted death, and dignified in his funeral obsequies—is beloved by Claudian, a centurion in the confidence, and afterwards in the service, of the Emperor Constantine. He has the misfortune (during the earlier part of the book) to be a Christian; but, irrespectively of that, Cyllene returns his affection, and they spend some happy days together among the olive groves of Surrentum with the approbation of Cethegus. But Numerian, prefect of the Prætorians, a man of influence with Maxentius, also loves Cyllene, and he has never yet been thwarted in any of his fancies. With such a keynote it is not difficult to fill in the music. The different stages of the story run on like the scenes of an opera, and most of the “situations” are more suggestive of the libretto of an opera than of a staid and respectable classical novel. Claudian is an early Christian, and departs himself accordingly. Numerian is cruel, treacherous, and unscrupulous, a Pagan of the worst days of paganism. Claudian is arrested among the olive groves of Surrentum, at Numerian's instigation, and condemned as a Christian. With many others of his sect his sentence is to fight himself to death with trained gladiators in the amphitheatre. To all appearance he succeeds in carrying out this sentence under Cyllene's loving eyes, and he disappears until the end of the last volume. Cyllene is still safe from Numerian under the protection of her

* *Cyllene; or, the Fall of Paganism*. By Henry Sneyd, M.A. London: Longmans. 1873.

father, and he accordingly is the next victim. A citation on a charge of conspiracy is served upon him at Aricia. He knows that his fate is sealed, and therefore, like a noble Roman as he was, he prefers euthanasia. A favourite mastiff and a faithful slave are still in the way, but after they are both despatched Numerian sees no obstacle to his success. He had overlooked the Catacombs, to which Cyllene had fled, and Christianity, which had received her into its bosom. By the blackest treachery he is on the point of overcoming even these difficulties, when the battle of the Milvian Bridge comes off somewhat unexpectedly, and, like the statue in the opera, puts an effectual check on Numerian's designs. He falls fighting along with his Prætorians on the banks of the Tiber, and Claudian appears victorious at the head of a "maniple," or some other division, of the army of Constantine. Poetical justice is thus satisfied. In this life even the Christians succeed to happiness, and the pagans are confounded. After all their troubles by earth, air, fire, and water, Claudian and Cyllene are united, and settle down to domestic life by "the blue waters of the Bosphorus," very much as a true-hearted hero and a persecuted heroine of the middle classes would have settled down about the time of Pamela in a semi-detached villa at Twickenham or Putney.

From this sketch of the story it is manifest that no objection can be taken to the character of the book. It is propriety itself. And, as young men and young maidens write nowadays, that is no small recommendation. But there is a good deal more to say in favour of it. The characters of both Cyllene and her father are carefully and successfully drawn. The scenes at Surrentum and at the country house at Aricia are graceful and full of feeling. The writing, though pompous in some places, is always clear, and, so far as we have noticed, accurate. But what is perhaps the highest merit of the book is the honest and simple religious tone that runs through it without disfiguring it by either cant or folly. "In the undercurrent," the author says, "which flows through the book, expression is given to the hope—vain perchance—which found a place in the breasts of such pagans as Cicero and Seneca, that the day may yet come when creeds shall cease to divide men with the strict line of demarcation which now exists." It is as pleasing as it is rare at the present time to meet with this spirit, or indeed with any spirit of reverence, in a young University man's first efforts, either in prose or verse. For, in these latter days, when childish philosophies, impracticable theories, and spurious religions take possession of youthful minds—when æstheticism is exalted into a holy revelation, and sensuality into a form of divine worship—the utmost that modest believers in Christianity can look for in the works of favourite authors is a decent covering thrown over the bones of what it is the fashion to regard as a kindly superstition.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 915, MAY 10, 1873:

The Imperial Meeting at St. Petersburg.

Mr. Stansfeld's Proposals. Bath and Gloucester Elections.
French Prospects. Sir Charles Dilke's Motion. Judicial Peacages.
The Debate on the Permissive Bill. Debtors and Charity.
Andrews v. Salt.

Alphonso's Wish.

Fellowships and Liberal Education. The Times and the Artists.
City Churches. Couriers for Vienna. Asylum Management. The Grocers Again.
Religious Affairs in Germany. The Royal Academy.
Hamlet at the Crystal Palace.

Dr. Mansel. The Pains of Memory.

The Fortescue Papers. Old Kensington.
Slave-Catching in the Indian Ocean. The Military Strength of Russia.
La Femme de Claude. Newmarket and Arabia.
Cyllene.

CONTENTS OF No. 914, MAY 3, 1873:

Mr. Smith's Motion—M. Barodet's Victory—Women Voters—Progress of Revolution in Spain—The Judicature Bill—The Emperor's Will—Irish Railways—The Vienna Exhibition—The Liberation Society.

Ages of Man—Nature-Worship—Letters to Young People—The Sanitary Digest—The Coral-Fishers of Capri—Mr. Macready—Mr. O'Keefe on Ultramontaniam—The Royal Academy—The Two Thousand Guinea.

Alexander von Humboldt—Dixon's Two Queens—Etruscan Inscriptions—Squire Silchester's Whim—Symonds's Records of the Rocks—Hughes's Memoir of a Brother—May—French Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—PARTICULAR ATTRACTIONS.

THIS DAY AND NEXT WEEK.

Saturday (May 10).—First Grand Summer Concert, at 2.

Monday.—Shakespeare's "Hamlet," at 2.30.

Tuesday.—Opera. "Don Giovanni," at 2.

Wednesday.—"Hamlet," at 2.30.

Thursday.—Opera.

Saturday.—Great Flower Show.

The Fine Arts Courts and Collections, including the Picture Gallery (the Works on Sale), the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open.

Admission, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturday (May 10), 1s.; Saturday (May 17), 7d. 6d.; or by Ticket purchased before the day, 5s. Guinea Season Ticket free.

ALEXANDRA PALACE will be OPENED on

SATURDAY, MAY 24.

SIR MICHAEL COSTA will conduct a GRAND CONCERT.

INTERNATIONAL FLOWER SHOW commences May 24.

ALEXANDRA PALACE and PARK, MUSWELL HILL, N.

THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—

The SIXTY-NINTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION is now OPEN, 5 Pall Mall East, from Nine till Seven. Admission, 1s. Catalogue, 6d.

ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

INSTITUTE of PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—

The THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION is now OPEN. Gallery, 53 Pall Mall. Admission, 1s.

JAMES FAHEY, Secretary.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the

PRÆTORIUM," with "Triumph of Christianity," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophytes," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six. Admission, 1s.

PICTURES in the LOUVRE GALLERY.—ON VIEW,

A Collection of fine AUTOTYPE PRINTS from the principal *chef-d'œuvre* in this celebrated Collection.—AUTOTYPE GRAND FINE ART GALLERY, 36 Rathbone Place (Next door to Winsor & Newton's).

ROYAL LITERARY FUND.—The EIGHTY-FOURTH

ANNIVERSARY DINNER of the Corporation will take place in Freemasons' Hall, on Wednesday, May 28.

The Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., in the Chair.

First List of Stewards.

The Earl of Aberdeen.

His Grace the Duke of Argyll, K.T.

Francis Bannoch, Esq., F.S.A.

George Bentley, Esq.

Bayle Bernard, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Binney.

The Lord Blachford.

William Bowman, Esq., F.R.S.

Robert Broadwater, Esq., F.R.G.S.

Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, M.P.

Benjamin Bond Cabell, Esq., M.A., F.R.S.

Right Hon. Sir James W. Colville.

The Hon. Henry Cowper, M.P.

Dr. Daunt, D.C.L.

His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G.

Rev. Robinson Duckworth, M.A.

Captain F. Duncan, R.A.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Durham.

Vicecount Enfield, M.P.

Sir William Fairbairn, Bart., F.R.S.

Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue, M.P.

George Godwin, Esq., F.R.S.

Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, M.P.

Charles Grimwade, Esq.

Right Hon. Sir James Hannen.

Henry Irving, Esq.

Sir Walter C. James, Bart., M.A.

Henry James, Esq., Q.C. M.P.

John Walter Jones, Esq., F.S.A.

Samuel Lang, Esq., M.P.

Lionel Lawson, Esq.

John Leighton, Esq., F.S.A.

Edward Levy, Esq.

10 John Street, Adelphi, W.C.

John Delaware Lewis, Esq., M.P., M.A.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Lincoln.

The Lord Lisgar.

Professor MacLagan, M.D., F.R.S.E.

Right Hon. William Moncell, M.P.

Julian S. Morgan, Esq.

Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P.

Kenneth R. Murchison, Esq.

The Lord Napier and Ettrick.

The Earl of Normanton.

Frederick Ouyry, Esq., F.S.A.

Love Jones-Parry, Esq., M.P.

John Pender, Esq., M.P.

Mr. Sheriff Perkins.

Jonathan Pim, Esq., M.P.

Thomas Henry Allen Foynder, Esq., M.A.

Baron De Reuter.

Edmund Routledge, Esq.

Lord Arthur Russell, M.P.

Sir Titus Salt, Bart.

Alfred Smece, Esq., F.R.S.

Right Hon. the Speaker.

William Stevens, Esq.

Russell Sturgis, Esq.

Tom Taylor, Esq., M.A.

The Lord Tenterden.

Anthony Trollope, Esq.

His Excellency M. Van de Weyer.

John Walter, Esq., M.P.

Sir Joseph Whitworth, Bart., D.C.L.

Rev. Canon Westcott, D.D.

W. G. Willis, Esq.

The Lord Bishop of Winchester.

OCTAVIAN BLEWITT, Secretary.

NEWSPAPER PRESS FUND.—Mr. J. A. FROUDE, M.A.,

will PRESIDE at the ANNUAL DINNER at Willis's Rooms, Saturday, May 17.

Tickets, 21s., to be had of the SECRETARY, 21 Cecil Street, Strand.

PUBLIC READING and SPEAKING.—The Rev. ALEX.

J. D. DORSEY, B.D., Lecturer at King's College, receives Members, Clergymen, and Candidates, as Visiting or Resident PUPILS.—13 Prince's Square, W.

THE LONDON CIVIL SERVICE and MILITARY COL-

LEGE, 21 York Place, Portman Square, W.—Principal, Dr. HEINEMANN, F.R.G.S.

Special and thorough PREPARATION for Cooper's Hill, the Line, Woolwich, the Civil Service, &c.

HIGHFIELD SCHOOL, Weston-super-Mare.—Conducted by

a Wrangler, assisted by a Graduate in Classical Honours. Terms, 281. Specially adapted for delicate Boys.—Address, GEORGE HEPPEL, M.A.

MILITARY APPOINTMENTS and CIVIL ENGINEERING.

The Rev. W. H. JOHNSTONE, M.A., formerly Professor, Examiner, and Chaplain in the Military Engineer College, Addiscombe; and Assistant-Examiner for the Indian Civil Engineer Service; continues to prepare CANDIDATES for Woolwich, Cooper's Hill, Direct Commission, &c.—Address, Bromsgrove House, Croydon.

EDUCATION.—BRIGHTON.—The Rev. H. FYFFE, M.A.

Oxon, has VACANCIES at Clifton House, West Brighton. Large Playground, Cricket-field, Gymnasium, Five Court, excellent and safe Bathing. Pupils have taken high places in the University, Local, Military, Civil, &c. Examinations, and at the Universities. Junior and delicate Boys receive special attention. Terms, 60 to 100 Guinea.

EDUCATION in GERMANY.—A PRUSSIAN PHYSICIAN

(Surgeon-Major in the Royal Army), residing in a middle-sized German Residence-town, receives into his house TWO BOYS of good family, to be educated with his own Sons. Healthy situation of house and garden. A celebrated College. Good private Lessons. Terms, 100 Guinea per annum.—For particulars and references address, A. SIMON, Bookseller, 110 Leadenhall Street, London.

FRENCH.—Conversation, Reading, Special LESSONS on

Pronunciation.—Translation.—Correspondence, by Dr. CLAUDON, Parisian, 443 Strand (Opposite the Charing Cross Station). Dr. CLAUDON is M.D. of Paris, and M.R.C.S. of England, and has had ten years' successful experience in Teaching. List of references sent free.

VISITING TUTOR.—CLASSICS, MATHEMATICS,

FRENCH.—A Teacher of much experience, who has prepared PUPILS, with most successful results, for the Universities, the Public Schools, and the Direct Commission in the Army. Highest testimonials.—Address, E. G. C., care of Mr. Allman, Publisher and Bookseller, 443 Oxford Street, W.C.

KING EDWARD the SIXTH'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL,

Lichfield.—A SECOND MASTER is WANTED immediately, a Graduate of Oxford, Cambridge, or London University, in Mathematical Honours, and with some experience in Teaching and Boy-government.—Address, HARP-MARTIN, Grammar School, Lichfield.

SAINT ALBANS KING EDWARD THE SIXTH GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—The HEAD-MASTERSHIP of the above School will become VACANT on the 5th day of June next. The Salary is £70 per annum, with the privilege of taking Boarders in his own Residence, to be educated in the School; and he is entitled to Two-thirds of the Quarterages on £4 and 6s per annum. There is a good House attached to the School, with a Garden and piece of Meadow Land. The Candidates must be in Holy Orders of the Church of England, and M.A. of Oxford or Cambridge. The appointment must be accepted subject to any alterations of the present scheme which may be made by the Endowed Schools Commissioners. A New Scheme for the School is now being framed, and the leading Provisions can be seen by Candidates at the Clerk's Office, at Saint Albans.

Applications and Testimonials to be forwarded to Mr. ISAAC NEWTON EDWARDS, Solicitor, Saint Albans, Clerk to the Trustees, on or before the 25th day of May now instant.

TO PAY SEVEN PER CENT. with the utmost SECURITY.
An INCOME of £485 per Annum, derived from CITY PROPERTY, in a First-class Situation; let on Lease to eminent Firms, who pay the Rents punctually; held at a Ground Rent for 99 Years; Purchase Money £6,500, part may remain on Mortgage. This is worth the attention of Trustees, as the trouble of Management is very small, a Notice quarterly to send the Rent being all that is necessary. The Building is in perfect order, and Tenants keep same in Repair, with some trifling exceptions.—Apply to Mr. MURDOX, 7 Fenchurch Street, City.

FURNISHED APARTMENTS for One or Two GENTLEMEN. The House is pleasantly situated close to the Shepherd's Bush, Metropolitan, and Great Western Stations. Access to City and West End every Ten Minutes.—Apply to Mr. DEAR, Picture Dealer, &c., Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

WANTED, by a respectable MAN and WIFE, without Incurance, the CARE of OFFICES, CHAMBERS, or any place of Trust.—Address, J. H. King, Stationer, Duke Street, Portland Place, W.—References unexceptionable.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill.
Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Turkish Baths, Consultations daily (Saturday excepted) at 2 Prince Street, Hanover Square, from Ten till Twelve.

INDIAN PARCEL POST.
Under Authority from the POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF INDIA.
Parcels not exceeding fifty pounds in weight and 2 ft. x 1 ft. x 1 ft. in size, and £20 in value, are conveyed by the PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL COMPANY from London to any Port Town in India at a uniform charge of 1s. 6d. per lb. Full Particulars on application at 122 LEADENHALL STREET, E.C.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Every endeavour is made to render this Hotel equal to its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.—Communications to THE MANAGER, Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.

THE GRANVILLE HOTEL, St. Lawrence-on-Sea.—Ramparts the nearest Station on both Lines. One of the most elegant, commodious, and comfortable Hotels in the Kingdom. Hydropathic, Turkish, Ozone, Saline, Plunge, and other Baths in the Hotel. Table-d'hôte daily.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS, ARMS, CRESTS, and ADDRESSES Designed, and Steel Dies Engraved as Gems. RAISED, BUSTIC, GROTESQUE, and ECCENTRIC MONOGRAMS artistically designed for any combination of Letters. NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES Stamped in Colour Relief, and brilliantly illuminated in Gold, Silver, and Colours, in the highest Style of Art. VISITING CARD-PLATE elegantly engraved, and 100 Superfine Cards printed for 5s. 6d. at HENRY RODRIGUES', 45 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

CRÈME de la CRÈME (the New Court Note Paper), made from Charla Perfecta. Registered.—The Public are respectfully CAUTIONED that the NEW COURT NOTE PAPER is to be had only of JENNIE & KNEWSTUB to the Queen, Heraldic Engravers and Stationers by Special Appointment to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales. Specimens of Monograms, Stamping, and Charla Perfecta free.—35 St. James's Street, and 48 Jersey Street, S.W.

MECHI'S DRESSING BAGS and CASES, DESPATCH BOXES, Tourists' Writing Cases, Jewel Cases, Writing Desks, Parisian Productions, Library Sets in Marvellous Leather, Albums, Cases of Fine Cutlery, Sewing Machines, Table Knives, the Master Razor, Strop and Paste, &c. MECHI'S, 112 Regent Street, W. Illustrated Catalogue post free. Established 1827. City Prices charged for Cash.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, W.C., and 34 Royal Exchange, E.C., Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL HOUSE and TURRET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, and H.R.H. the Prince of Wales; Makers of the Great Clock of the House of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.
E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, 34 and 35 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and the Factory, Savoy Street, Strand, London.

ALUMINIUM WATCHES, £1 1s., £1 10s., £1 15s., £2 2s. Marvellous Timekeepers. Machine made. Same as supplied by us to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales. Illustrations, Three Stamps.—MILLIKIN & LAWLEY, 168 Strand.

LONDON & RYDER, Diamond Merchants.—Wedding Bracelets, Wedding Necklaces, and Wedding Presents, of every description. Bridesmaids' Lockets, of new and original Designs, with a large variety of Diamond Ornaments of artistic merit, in the best possible taste and of sterling excellence, at Messrs. LONDON & RYDER'S, Diamond Merchants, 17 New Bond Street, corner of Clifford Street.

CUTLERY, Warranted.—The most varied Assortment of TABLE CUTLERY in the World, all warranted, is on Sale at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S.

The Blades are all of the finest Steel.	Table Knives.	Desert Knives.	Carvers.
14-Inch Ivory Handles..... per Dozen	15	15	per Pair 7
34 ditto Balance ditto	20	16	" 7
3 ditto ditto	35	24	" 8
3 ditto ditto	37	26	" 10
4 ditto extra large ditto	40	30	" 10 6
4 ditto African Ivory ditto	45	36	" 15
Ditto, with Silver Ferrules	48	38	" 18
Ditto, with Silver Blades	52	40	" 19 6
Nickel Electro Silvered Handles ..	24	19	" 7 6

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 800 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with List of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, postage free, 30 Oxford Street, W. 1, A. 2, 3 and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard, London, W. The cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

STAINED GLASS WINDOWS and CHURCH DECORATIONS.—HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE, Garrick Street, Covent Garden, London. Prize Medal, London and Paris.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS, Self-Colling, Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

SMEE'S DESIGNS of FURNITURE and of IRON and BRASS BEDSTEADS.

A New and Revised Edition of this Work is now issued, in a size convenient for transmission by post, and will be forwarded, on application, by W. A. & S. SMEE, 6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON.

FILMER & SON'S EASY CHAIRS and COUCHES.—The largest assortment in the Kingdom, comprising all the Designs for which they have been celebrated for the last fifty years, and also all the Newest Patterns, combining grace, elegance, and comfort. Five hundred different Patterns always in Stock. New Designs are being almost daily added. All are of the best quality and marked in plain figures.—Show-Rooms and Galleries, 31 and 33 Berners Street, London, W.

FUNERAL REFORM.—The LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY conducts FUNERALS with Simplicity and with great Economy. Prospectuses free.—Chief Office, 3 Lancaster Place, Strand, W.C.

LADIES' BEAUTIFULLY MADE ENAMELLED KID BOOTS, 2s. To Burton or Elastic Sides. Soft House Boots, 5s. 6d. Morocco or Linen Slippers, 3s. 6d. Catalogues post free. THOMAS D. MARSHALL, 125 Oxford Street, W.

KINAHAN'S .LL. WHISKY. This celebrated and most delicious old mellow Spirit is the very CREAM of IRISH WHISKIES, is unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the Red Seal, Pink Label and Cork headed "Kinahan's .LL. Whisky." Wholesale Depot, 20 GREAT TITCHFIELD STREET, OXFORD STREET, W.

INNS OF COURT HOTEL, LIMITED.

CAPITAL £100,000, in 5,000 Shares of £20 each.

No Payment required on Application. £2 per Share payable on Allotment. It is not intended to call up more than £10 per Share.

Directors.

L. BISHOP, Esq., Regent Hotel, Leamington.
JAMES W. CLAYTON, Esq., Sunnyside, Hampton.
JOHN HALL, Esq., Great Western Hotel, Birmingham; President of Hotel-keepers' Association.
T. C. BROWN WESTHEAD, Esq., London, and Stoke-upon-Trent.
WILLIAM HEATHCOTE, Esq., Standard Brewery, Manchester.

Bankers.

LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK, and their Branches.
THE BIRMINGHAM BANKING COMPANY, Limited, Birmingham.
THE MANCHESTER AND COUNTY BANK, Limited, Manchester.

Solicitor.

JOHN HOLMES, Esq., 31 Clement's Lane, London.

OFFICES—INNS OF COURT HOTEL, HOLBORN, LONDON.

ABRIDGED PROSPECTUS.

This Company is formed to purchase the important property known as the INNS OF COURT HOTEL, Holborn, with the option of acquiring the unfinished building connected therewith in Lincoln's Inn Fields, in close proximity to the new Palace of Justice, now in course of erection. This great Hotel has recently undergone extensive alterations, and now compares most favourably with any first-class hotel in London.

It is a matter of public notoriety that, by order of the Court of Chancery, the entire property was sold last year for less than one-third its cost.

Preliminary arrangements have been entered into to acquire, for the sum of £50,000, a lease of the Hotel for a term of 99 years, at a ground-rent of £1,200 per annum. The furniture, fixtures, fittings, and other effects, upon which about £30,000 has been expended, are to be taken upon payment of the sum of £10,000, or at a valuation, at the option of the Company. The Company will also have the right of acquiring the building, fronting Lincoln's Inn, communicating with the Hotel, upon terms equally advantageous.

It will be remembered that the Langham Hotel was purchased by a Joint-Stock Company for about half its original cost, under circumstances somewhat similar. The last dividend paid to the proprietors in that undertaking was at the rate of 15 per cent., besides handsome additions to the reserved funds.

The Directors invite careful consideration and investigation of this undertaking, believing as they do that, with prudent and vigilant management, a sound and profitable investment is offered, based upon substantial and improving property.

The Contract, with Copies of the Memorandum and Articles of Association, and of the Certificates as to value of Messrs. LOCKWOOD & MAYSON, and Mr. HERBERT THOMAS STEWARD, of the firm of HUNT & STEWARD, may be seen at the Office of the Solicitor.

Full Prospectus and Forms of Application may be obtained of the Manager, Mr. ROSSALL, at the Hotel; or of the Directors or Solicitors.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE.—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 15 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

The Forty-seventh Annual General Meeting of the Company was held at Edinburgh on April 25, 1873.

Results communicated in the Report.

Amount proposed for Assurance during the Year 1872 (2,353 proposals) £1,426,555 3 4

Amount of Assurances accepted during the Year 1872 (1,965 policies) .. 1,190,453 10 0

Annual Premiums on New Policies during the Year 1872 .. 40,680 13 2

Claims by Death during the Year 1872, exclusive of bonus additions .. 384,369 16 5

Amount of Assurances accepted during the last Five Years .. 5,027,563 1 1

Subscribed Assurances, 1873 (of which £82,419 10s. 6d. is re-assured with other Offices) .. 17,244,604 8 2

Revenue, upwards of Seven Hundred Thousand Pounds per annum.

Assets, upwards of Four Millions sterling.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY was established at Edinburgh in 1855. The Act of Parliament, 2nd and 3rd Gal. IV., cap. 81, and 4th and 5th Vict., cap. 75, also 22nd and 23rd Vict., cap. 27, have been granted for the purpose of its constitution and for the regulation of its affairs. It has been conducted with much success, and that result may be attributed not only to the extensive and industrial connections of the Company, but more particularly to the liberality of its dealings, and to the constant attention paid by the Directors to the adoption of improvements and facilities in connexion with the contract of life assurance.

THE COMPANY HAVE DIVIDED PROFITS ON EIGHT OCCASIONS, IN 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, and 1870, when very large additions were made to Policies.

The next division of Profits will be made in 1875.

WILL THOS. THOMSON, Manager.

H. JONES WILLIAMS, General Secretary for England.

Tables of Rates and all further information can be obtained by application at the Offices of the Company, or at any of the Agencies:

LONDON.—18 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.; and 3 PAUL MALL EAST.

EDINBURGH.—3 & 5 GEORGE STREET.

DUBLIN.—56 UPPER SACKVILLE STREET.

GLASGOW.—106 ST. VINCENT STREET.

MANCHESTER.—110 KING STREET.

Colonial and Foreign Assurances. Assurances granted on the Lives of Persons proceeding Abroad. Branch Offices and Agencies in India and all the British Colonies.

THE SCOTTISH IMPERIAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

LONDON.—2 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.

GLASGOW.—56 WEST GEORGE STREET.

For Fire, Life, and Annuities.

Life Assurances with or without participation in Profits.

Non-Fortitude Assurances.—Tables are prepared showing the terms by which, at any time after the expiry of Three Years, the Company's ordinary Life Policies may be surrendered, or Paid-up Assurances on a liberal scale allowed in lieu thereof.

H. AMBROSE SMITH, Secretary and Actuary.

GENERAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

CHIEF OFFICE.—62 KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Established 1837. CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

The public estimation of this Office is shown in the rapid and continuous increase in its Life business, as set forth in the Reports and Statements, which may be had on application at the Chief Office, or any of the Branches.

GEORGE SCOTT FREEMAN, Secretary.

PHENIX FIRE OFFICE,

LOMBARD STREET and CHANCERY CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1782.

Prompt and Liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEO. W. LOVELL } Secretaries.
JOHN J. BROOMFIELD }

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1800.

10 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 and 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,500,000. PAID UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.

EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1807. (For Lives only.)

79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.